

The
American Historical Review

THE INTERNATIONAL STATE OF THE MIDDLE AGES:
SOME REASONS FOR ITS FAILURE¹

SO much has been said during the last few years about an international organization which shall bring peace and order to the people of the world and so little about previous efforts of society to achieve the same result that it seems not inappropriate to sketch again the outlines of one of the most successful of those attempts.

It might appear rather rash, certainly visionary, to propose that the League of Nations, or Conference on the Limitation of Armament (new style), be empowered not only to administer territories gained by joint conquest, but, also, to recruit armies and levy taxes directly from the people, without the intermediation of national governments; to act as a supreme court, with original jurisdiction in cases arising between nations or against rulers of nations, and with appellate jurisdiction in all cases whether of nations or individuals; and to execute its judgments whether against individuals or against states, even to the extent of making war upon an obstinate state. That would seem a very dangerous array of powers, indeed, and yet, you will agree, this is but a sober summary of the powers actually exercised by such an international authority through nearly two centuries of medieval history.

Of the various attempts to achieve international control in the Middle Ages only one need receive our serious attention, however high the hopes and ambitions of the others. This is the one headed by the papacy in the days from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. It has been customary to trace its development in the evolution of papal theories and policies of temporal power reaching back all the way to Roman days. That path, however, is a rather tortuous one, like an old and abandoned road through the northern forest. Seldom smooth,

¹ This paper was read at the St. Louis meeting of the American Historical Association, Dec. 28, 1921.

it is often lost altogether in a morass of local Roman politics, while the intervals of solid footing afforded by a Gregory I., Nicholas I., Benedict IX., Sylvester II., Leo IX. are so few and the stretches of morass so long as to raise a legitimate doubt about the existence of any such road.

But there is a detour to the development of that international control which is continuous, is relatively free from depressions, and leads to the goal. This starts at the opening of the tenth century in southern and southeastern France. It begins not in ecclesiastical theory, but in a joint effort of churchmen and laymen, society in short, to re-establish peace and decency out of the brutal chaos into which Europe had been thrown by the civil wars of Charlemagne's descendants and the simultaneous raids of Northman, Saracen, Hungarian, and Slav. Under the cover of local defense which these calamities had necessitated had arisen a menace of indiscriminate and almost universal private warfare which continued after the external danger had subsided. For this, however, there was no justification except the selfish desire of armed men to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the unarmed or each other. Destruction of crops and means of sustenance, constant danger of life and limb to non-combatants, and unscrupulous appropriation of common property and livings for private use—all this was too heavy a burden to bear without protest.

This protest was first effectively voiced in southern and eastern France, probably because this region was a sheltered one, and, having suffered least from the foreign raids, was soonest free from them. The people could expect no help from the papacy, for the papacy was submerged in the mire of Roman party strife, nor from other secular clergy, most of whom were similarly mired in the welter of feudal competition. Nor could they look for any help from kings whose power did not extend beyond their petty feudal domain. Their chief hope must rest in themselves, in their local co-operation, their own activity as a self-determining society.

Perhaps the first advance in this direction was the rehabilitation of monasticism through the founding of Cluny. That Cluny became an international force was the result of circumstances, not the least of which was its remarkable series of abbots. But there were others as well. Its location on one of the main highways to Rome advertised its virtues more widely than was the usual lot even of good monasteries. Most of all, however, Cluny represented a general desire. As requests came for its monks to establish similar houses elsewhere or to reform existing monasteries, the abbots laid down

YALLI TRA TAAO
100H02

certain stipulations to guard against the relapses so general among religious communities. Related monasteries were to be subsidiary—their heads, priors trained at Cluny and subject to annual inspection—in short, the “congregation” of Cluny. Every house added to the Congregation meant just that much more subtracted from the mailed fist of feudalism and private warfare. It meant much more than this, for nearly all the extensions of the Congregation were at the request of the lay community and this evidenced the growth of a more peaceful public opinion. With the spread of the Congregation this public was given an effective organization through which flagging localities could derive not only spiritual but often material reinforcement as well. Before the eleventh century ended it had already become international, penetrating Italy, Spain, the Empire, as well as all of France. In this area it not only served as a medium of intercommunication for the opposition to feudal violence, but even more as an agency for arousing such opposition. It was the Committee on Public Information, the bureau of propaganda in this cause, and it was also a political machine, better disciplined and more intelligently managed than some which, in more enlightened days, have served to terrorize communities.²

The same region which produced Cluny at the beginning of the tenth century invented the Peace of God before the opening of the eleventh. Lay historians have not dealt kindly with this institution. Gibbon, in cynical mood, dismissed it with a very incidental mention. Milman, after describing it at some length, warns the reader in a foot-note not to take it seriously, by saying, “history hardly recalls a single instance of its observance.” Bury, in his revision of Gibbon, is more curt in his dismissal of it. These have been followed by our text-books, and, though they all mention it, they do so in a spirit of lofty contempt, as one of those colorful incidents of the past whose apparent naïveté is so flattering to our sense of superior attainment. It is difficult to resist a speculation as to the treatment which future historians will accord our Naval Holiday and 5-5-3 ratio. The Peace of God and its early elaboration, the Truce of God, are viewed much more seriously by the legal historians. Maitland goes so far as to deem it the most important preliminary to the development of modern criminal law. The opinions of Luchaire and Haskins are scarcely less favorable. Mr. Wells would have done better to have followed the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* than the text-books in this instance.

² Cf. the position and relations of Hirschau in Germany and of Camaldoli in Italy.

131
1075

Without entering into the controversy further, certain features of these two institutions should be cited. The first Peace of God was a modest enactment against "*infractores ecclesiarum, res pauperum diripientes et clericorum percussores*". The first Truce of God set aside the period from Saturday until Monday as sacred from the profanation of private warfare. Both met with speedy favor and were enacted by church councils outside of southern France in an ever-widening circle until they were taken up by the papacy and proclaimed for all Christendom. They were re-enacted again and again, but—this has been usually overlooked—not as mere re-enactments. They were being constantly expanded and becoming more specific in their application. Before the thirteenth century was very old the modest and general indictment of Charroux had become a specific exemption of all ecclesiastical buildings and their environs, all clerks, merchants, women, and peasants, as well as orchards, seeds, cattle, and agricultural implements, from the violence of private feudal warfare. The Truce of God had been extended sometimes to a period of several months and regularly included all days from Thursday to Monday and all festival days, besides certain special occasions, which left all told less than a fourth of a year to the unabated practice of feudal warfare.

It has usually been assumed that these institutions lacked enforcement and that the tortures of the damned were punishments too remote to deter the brutal and easily aroused passion for private warfare. That they were repeatedly violated, too, cannot be denied. Possibly, however, historians have judged too hastily from the violation. Practically from the beginning these institutions were given the full support of the Congregation of Cluny. Its monks were prominent in the councils at which they were enacted. In some districts all Christians at the age of fifteen and over were to take solemn oath for their observance. At the Council of Clermont it was prescribed that all men, whether noble, burgess, villain, or serf, above the age of twelve, should take the oath of adherence to the Truce every three years. And long before this, it should be remembered, it had become customary in certain localities to exact from the candidate for knighthood an oath to maintain the Peace of God. The so-called Code of Chivalry which became generally recognized in the twelfth century is a compound of feudal allegiance and the Peace of God. Progress such as this cannot be dismissed as a total failure.

The enforcement of these two institutions was not limited to this development of spiritual inhibitions alone. Their champions, even the purely ecclesiastical, showed an astonishing amount of practical wisdom. It was early discovered that the vast majority of offenses

and violations arose from the material ambitions of petty knights and vassals. The greater lords had less to gain and more to lose by the incessant practice of violence. At least, they could afford to scorn the temptation to pillage mere peasants, small merchants, and priests. Their own dangers came chiefly from their lesser vassals, who did yield only too frequently to such petty temptations. This cleavage among the promoters of private warfare was easily seized upon and the greater lords, especially the kings, were invited to lend their material support to the measure. What a boon to these! To have the non-combatant productive population thus welded together in the support of the Peace of God would furnish them an anvil upon which they could hammer out the flaming ambitions of their troublesome vassals into some degree of obedience. Some of the great nobles saw the light very quickly, others were helped to it by the sage counsel of the abbot of Cluny or other churchmen. The pious Robert of France was able to recommend the measure most heartily and so, too, the equally pious Henry II. of Germany. In the excess of their zeal at Mouzon, these two monarchs solemnly discussed the project of bringing peace to all Europe by this means. The idea appealed powerfully to Henry II. and, though he may have forgotten the ideal of universal peace, it cannot be said of him that he overlooked the possibility of incurring eternal reward in the enhancement of his own power. Promotion of the Peace of God and the other aims of Cluny proved his most effective means to this end. Other nobles took up the idea and lent their indorsement to the proclamations of the Peace. The hot-headed vassal who so far forgot himself as to risk the more remote danger of eternal damnation might cool somewhat more rapidly at the prospect of such an immediate foretaste, and if Huberti's contention that the separate proclamations of peace by lay rulers arose from its proclamation by the Church is sustained, this constitutes a most eloquent testimonial to the success of the Peace and Truce of God.

The next step forward in the cause of peace was the capture of the papal office from the clutches of the feudal factions of Rome. Cluny and the organized public opinion which it represented had made various efforts to accomplish this. The support of Benedict IX., the brief régime of Sylvester II., and the abortive attempt of Gregory VI. might be cited among the more striking of these. But what they had failed to accomplish as yet by pure moral force they were now enabled to achieve with the help of Henry III. at Sutri. The threat in the election of Leo IX., that this victory did not mean merely a transfer of vassalage from Roman nobles to German king,

was carried out fully after Henry's death. By that time the moral forces skillfully directed by Hildebrand, himself a disciple of Cluny, were strong enough to hold the office against feudal assault. The significance of the Investiture struggle which followed, in this approach to the formation of the international state, lay in the freedom thereby gained by the papacy from the violence of temporal interference. Where Cluny was in 910 the papacy was two centuries later. The parallel might be carried further. The remarkable succession of abbots of Cluny during that time was equalled by the sustained standards of the papacy at least as far as Innocent III., and to the "Congregation" idea of Cluny might be compared the effective organization of the secular and regular Church under the control of the papacy.

With the support of the papacy the cause of peace and order could hope for larger results. The peace which had already been so largely won from the petty lordlings could now be wrested from the greater lords and kings as well. The task remaining was twofold: to find an effective substitute for war in the solution of disputes, and to devise a temporal weapon to control the great lords whom it might now be necessary to discipline. The first was at hand in the law, both canon and civil, whose study was so rapidly promoted during the twelfth century by the help of Gratian and Irnerius. The second was more difficult. The Investiture struggle had proven that just as the kings could be called upon to suppress the violence of the lesser nobility, so conversely could the nobility be used to bring effective pressure upon refractory kings. But this was a doubtful resource, a sowing of dragon's teeth, whose consequences would be but a small blessing to society, as Central Europe learned to its sorrow. A less dangerous weapon appeared in the success of the First Crusade.

No one, I presume, would seriously urge that the Crusades were instituted as a war to end war, a means to universal peace. And yet this thought was a factor even in the First Crusade. The first act of the Council was to proclaim the Truce of God. It was also this Council which provided for the triennial renewal of the oath by all men of all classes for the observance of the Truce. And every one of the chroniclers who recorded the speech of Urban included in it the pope's lament at the spectacle of Christian shedding Christian blood, when salvation might be obtained by turning their weapons to the conquest of the Holy Land. The slogan, "If you must fight, go fight the Infidel," proved a powerful deterrent to private warfare as early as the First Crusade, and was so used throughout the next two centuries. It served to paralyze the petty noble who saw an oppor-

tunity to add to his possessions or privileges at the expense of his overlord or neighbor, and equally to halt powerful kings in the midst of their struggles. The five-year truce won from the outraged Richard and the crafty Philip, and the voluntary exile of Henry the Lion were but examples of a frequent practice, while at the very end of the thirteenth century the need of another crusade was still the most powerful argument Boniface VIII. could urge to compel mediation in the dispute between Edward I. and Philip IV. King and noble and commoner alike were compelled to stay their violence against the possessions or family of those who had marked themselves with the Cross. However legitimate might be the complaints against such as these, they must be settled in the courts of the Church or stayed until the Cross was removed. And thus, though blood was shed in quantities in the East, to Europe the Crusades meant peace.

One other purpose the crusade served. When the troops led by Robert of Normandy arrived at Rome on their way to the East, they stopped a little while to exchange blows with Urban's enemies at Rome. This lesson was not lost upon the popes, but it remained for Innocent III. to demonstrate the full possibilities of the Crusades as a weapon against incorrigibles in the West. Usually the mere threat of a crusade was sufficient to bring kings to terms. Frederick II. required the actual execution of the project, and in the fate of his successors was demonstrated the full power of the weapon.

By the time of Innocent the Church with the papacy at its head had become an international state. It had everything that a state has—and more. It could raise funds by direct taxation and raise armies equally directly. It could bring offenders to the courts of justice, and it had the means of executing its judgments. It applied its laws equally to peasant and king and it executed judgments against both. It controlled education, controlled the agencies of publicity, and controlled the courts. The social cares of charity and public health were in its hands. And on top of all this, it wielded the awful power of eternal life or death. Never in history have the moral forces of so vast a society been so thoroughly concentrated and so effective. As an experiment in practical idealism, it is still without equal.

Viewed solely in the West, the progress of the papacy was ever upward to the time of Innocent. The advance was accompanied by constant struggles, but in practically every struggle the papacy appeared as the champion of the common needs and desires of society against the selfish interests of individuals or groups. The popes displayed a willingness to undergo discomforts and dangers in behalf of

the justice of their cause and society rewarded them by ever increased confidence and delegations of power. Under Innocent the full extent of this power was displayed for the first time, and his successors maintained it at that pitch for a century before it began to decline noticeably.

I do not desire to deceive you or myself with the thought that this reaction against feudal warfare was the sole cause and explanation of the international state of the Middle Ages. Other causes were operating to the same end. But the theory that this structure was erected solely upon the ignorance and credulity of society by a combination of supernatural inspiration and unscrupulous fabrication of documents leaves too much to be explained. The more or less conscious acquiescence of society in the arrangement was absolutely necessary. Such acquiescence was obtained through the promise of peace held out by the Church, and society was receiving its *quid pro quo*.

And now for the opposite side of this picture, the causes for the collapse of this international power. The chief causes are usually found in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and are too well known to require elaboration here. The greatest of these, however, the rise of the national states, deserves some consideration—not because they functioned as political organizations, for Innocent III. had clearly shown that the papacy had ample resources to cope with organizations of that scope, but because the national state built up a moral force opposed to the papacy. This is the most significant factor in the struggle between the popes and the kings and it is the factor which has been least well explained.

Possibly the papacy itself was in some measure responsible for this untoward development. In its management of the great military expeditions of the Crusades it apparently failed to realize the necessity of undivided leadership. Only the First Crusade revealed any real degree of unification through the efforts of the papal representative, the effects of which were apparent long after that representative had died. The Second and Third Crusades failed notoriously, chiefly because of their divided command. The leaders were more or less rivals and they were able to unify the natural friction among their followers as a national force which was kept alive long after the expeditions by the growth of tradition and literature designed for self-justification. Thus the kings dodged the responsibility for their selfish ambitions and rivalry, while in the long run the repeated failures of crusading expeditions must necessarily weaken the papacy which preached them. In view of the resources of military leadership afforded by the Templars and Hospitallers and the immense moral

force of the papacy this unfortunate result would seem to have been avoidable.

The loss of support from the growing commercial interest was likewise a factor in the downfall of the international state. Trade grew rapidly with the spread of peace in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It attained international proportions and had an international organization even before the thirteenth century. *A priori* a close alliance between the business elements interested in international trade and the international state of the Church would seem inevitable. And yet such was not the case. Whether the ecclesiastical nature of the Church state imposed limits upon it incompatible with or hostile to close co-operation with international trade or whether the constitutional aversion of the Church to new social movements (for such the growth of trade undoubtedly was in the twelfth century) led to hostility, is beyond the limit of this paper to decide. The fact remains that in England and France the greater commercial interests cast in their lot with the kings even against the Church, while in Germany, where the king was impotent, they sought safety and protection in leagues among themselves rather than in the Church. As early as the Second and much more clearly in the Fourth Crusade these commercial elements appear in hostility to papal plans. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they are often found harboring the chief opponents of the papacy. This loss of support to the papacy was all the more serious because these commercial interests had a wide-spread organization capable of influencing public opinion powerfully, while their wealth thrown to the support of kings constituted no mean item in the success of the latter.

Perhaps an even more serious fault in papal management was that revealed by the condition of the Church in the Holy Land when the kings of Jerusalem began to weaken. Through circumstances doubtless more than through policy the various important ecclesiastical establishments in the Holy Land had been taken under the direct jurisdiction of the popes. The fact that the devotion of countless pilgrims had showered upon them properties located over all Christendom might have necessitated such action. Its effect however was to subtract these establishments from the authority of the local prelates. Even the cathedral chapter of the Holy Sepulchre had its separate agent at Rome, while the important monasteries, *e.g.* Mary of Josaphat, military orders, Templars and Hospitallers, and secular establishments like Bethlehem, Hebron, and Nazareth all had independent access to the papacy. In the Holy Land, each was jealous of its own independence and after 1163 their actions seemed to be governed

much more by fear of encroachments upon that independence than by the necessity of united action against the foe. The secular prelates had long watched this diminution of their authority with disfavor and were particularly resentful toward the Templars and Hospitallers, whose activities recognized no diocesan limitations. As early as the middle of the twelfth century the patriarch Foucher, with an imposing retinue of archbishops and bishops, took his way to Rome to complain to the Holy Father against these military orders, only to find that they were stronger in the papal favor than he and his bishops. This repulse left him in no happier frame of mind, while it strengthened the pretensions of all independent elements against him. As a consequence, when the kings of Jerusalem failed and the direct responsibility for the conduct of affairs might have been assumed by the patriarch, there arose instead an endless wrangle among the various ecclesiastical and secular leaders, which doubtless hastened, if it did not cause, the downfall of Jerusalem in 1087.

In the West this weakness, so fatal in the Latin East, did not appear until the thirteenth century. It is true that there had been some friction between the White Monks of Clairvaux and the Black Monks of Cluny and some between the seculars and regulars in the twelfth century. But on the whole this mutual criticism had been helpful rather than hurtful and had in general redounded to the power of the international state through the improvement of its agencies. But in the thirteenth century, when the two orders of friars were founded and the military orders were gradually forced out of the Holy Land back upon Europe, trouble grew apace. The papal register became crowded with complaints of seculars against regulars and of regulars against each other. In general these cases were decided by the papacy in favor of the universal clergy as against the local clergy and in favor of one or another order depending upon the peculiar affiliations of the particular pope. To the papacy the multiplication of these cases on the papal docket might have seemed a flattering and concrete evidence of the unity and power of the Church centralized in itself. The disappointed litigants, however, left the papal court with the sting of rebuke rankling in their hearts and not a whit more kindly disposed toward their opponents than before. Thus what may have seemed unity to the head of the Church was chaos to its lay members, for society now found its direct moral leaders divided among themselves. So bitter was the friction between the seculars and regulars or between the various regulars that it was a poor cause indeed even against the papacy which could not

command the support of a considerable portion of the clergy, as witness the *Defensor Pacis* in behalf of Ludwig of Bavaria.

That the kings would be restive under the restraints imposed by the papacy for keeping the peace had been only too evident. They had lent their support to the building of the international state as long as that process had conduced to their own increased power. In return the Church had lent nearly all its resources to strengthen the power of the kings. It had hedged their thrones about with a certain divinity, it had lent its officers to mould public opinion in behalf of the kings against the lesser nobility. It had done much to substitute respect for law in the place of violence as the proper solvent of disputes. It had developed law and trained lawyers. In France and England, where the kings had, on the whole, been obedient until the end of the thirteenth century, the powers of local nobles had been effectually clipped beyond hope of speedy revival; in the Empire, whose rulers had been more troublesome, the powers of local nobles had been retained as a counterweight. But everywhere, as late as the thirteenth century, the moral forces had still been effectively centred in the Church.

Now, however, those moral forces were divided and the kings felt themselves in a position to further their selfish ambitions by violence. In vain did Boniface VIII. seek to restrain them. Able lawyers trained by the Church enabled the kings to meet every move of the pope, even to the extent of gaining church money with which to carry on very unholy wars. By supporting the claims of the local churchmen against the encroachments of the central authority the kings gained the neutrality, if not always the active support, of the local clergy in their struggle against the papacy. The right of asylum, such a boon to society in the days of local warfare, was now made to appear as a refuge for criminals and scoundrels. Even the attack upon the benefit of clergy was given the support of some of the local churchmen. Papal revenues for the maintenance of the international organization were attacked as unwarranted exactions for which society had no return and even the appeals to papal courts were denounced as venal devices. The kings contended that they maintained the peace, that they could offer impartial and speedy justice to all, and that there was no need to pay both papacy and kings for this service. This contention was supported in France and England before the end of the thirteenth century by the financial aid of the greater business interests and by the moral support of many of the local clergy. The Model Parliament of 1296 and the Estates-General of 1302 will serve as concrete examples. And when, after 1305, the Babylonish Cap-

tivity of the papacy made it seemingly subservient to the French crown, the international control by the papacy was practically gone and the era of unrestrained national warfare begun. The plight of the papacy during the next two centuries—first in Captivity, then in Schism, and after that again under the baneful influence of local Italian factions—rendered the re-establishment of the international state difficult, while with the success of the Protestant revolt, it became impossible.

Now that six centuries have convinced society that unrestrained national warfare is just as devastating and destructive and scarcely less direct than the neighborhood warfare of feudal times, we see it again groping toward some form of international control. The Balance of Power, the Holy Alliance, the Hague Tribunal, the League of Nations, and the Conference on the Limitation of Armament are all attempts in this direction, not unlike those which preceded the achievement of international control in the Middle Ages. The parallel is so striking as to give added point to the study of this medieval experiment, but such study should include a greater consideration of the influence of public opinion and the organization of the moral forces of society than has hitherto been given.

AUGUST C. KREY.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES, 1768-1782

A COMPARISON of the list of offices included in a modern British cabinet with a similar list of 1760 shows that the number of secretaries of state has increased from two to five. This growth in numbers, however, has not altered the theory that there is but one secretariat, that new secretarial portfolios are not, in the eyes of the law and the constitution, new, and that each secretary of state has the full power and authority inherent in the secretarial seals and may perform any of the duties of his brother secretaries. This theory may be briefly summarized: although there is but one secretariat, there may be as many secretaries as the business of state demands, each of whom may exercise the full powers of the secretariat. This constitutional fiction has been so consistently adopted in the nineteenth century to meet the exigencies of an expanding government—and possibly to avoid the inconveniences and prohibitions of the Act of Settlement and the Place Acts of Anne—that it may not be amiss to call attention to a series of incidents which, had they attained their purpose, would have stopped this subdivision of the secretariat and thus would have altered the form and appearance of the cabinet. At the same time this brief survey will serve to call attention to an office which has never received sufficient study—the office of secretary of state for the colonies, 1768-1782.

The particular problem with which this paper is concerned may be illustrated by an incident in the debate which foreshadowed the end of the colonial secretaryship. The first clause of Burke's Establishment Bill as presented in the House of Commons in 1780 provided for the abolition of "the office commonly called or known by the name of third secretary of state or secretary of state for the colonies". Governor Pownall suggested that the only description necessary was "third secretary of state", but Lord George Germain, who held the office in question, objected to any qualifying terms, for the reason that he was neither third secretary of state nor secretary of state for the colonies, but "one of his Majesty's principal secretaries of state"¹—a position he had taken in a previous session when he had described himself as "secretary of state at large".² "He wished most sincerely," however, "if the committee should determine to

¹ *Parl. Hist.*, XXI. 193-194.

² *Id.*, XX. 266.

abolish any one of the three offices, that it might be the one he had the honour to fill."³ This protest availed nothing; the original wording was retained in the final bill, passed in 1782.⁴ The issue is fairly joined: Was the colonial secretary a secretary "at large"; did he have the full power and authority of the secretarial seals; was he of equal rank with the two secretaries on the older foundations?

The establishment of a colonial secretaryship was imminent in the days when Halifax presided at the Board of Trade,⁵ it was advocated by Thomas Pownall in his well-known *Administration of the Colonies*, it was made the condition on which Dartmouth was willing to continue office in 1766, it was contemplated by Pitt in the same year,⁶ and it was finally accomplished as a part of the Grafton-Bedford bargain in January, 1768, when the Earl of Hillsborough, who had twice been president of the Board of Trade, received a commission as one of his Majesty's principal secretaries of state. This commission was in the same form as the usual secretarial commission, except for the insertion of a preamble which stated, "Whereas the public business of our colonies and plantations increasing, it seemeth expedient to us to appoint one other principal secretary of state besides our two ancient secretaries. . . ."⁷ Was this preamble intended as a limitation on the powers of the new office, or was it simply an explanation of its main interests? No such limitation or explanation was necessary in the commissions of the other secretaries, custom having prescribed their immediate functions without having confined their power to the exercise of those functions: either secretary could, if need were, perform the duties of both. If the new secretary did not have the same right, then he was not, in fact, a real secretary of state. There was no doubt, however, in regard to the purpose of the new department. The colonial business heretofore transacted by the secretary of state for the southern department (Shelburne) was taken over by Hillsborough, while the change in the Board of Trade in July, 1768, by which he became the active head, rather than a formal ex officio member of the Board, and the order to the colonial governors directing them to correspond only with the new secretary and to discontinue the practice of sending duplicates of their letters to the Board,⁸ mark the complete identification of the new department with the colonies.

³ Note 1.

⁴ 22 George III., c. 82.

⁵ Especially in 1757, when Newcastle definitely promised Halifax the seals but was prevented by Pitt from carrying out his promise.

⁶ Williams, *Earl of Chatham*, II. 214, note.

⁷ Public Record Office, Patent Rolls, 8 George III., pt. 2, memb. 8.

⁸ Public Record Office, C. O. 5: 241, July 4, 1768.

The close connection between the Board of Trade and the secretary of state for the colonies confused the situation for contemporaries and obscures many points of detail for historians. The Board of Trade, founded by royal commission in 1696, had become the medium of communication between the government and the colonies and was the body in England most familiar with all colonial affairs. It had never had executive power, however, and at the time of the establishment of the colonial secretaryship in 1768 it had become "a board of advice and council upon such points only as shall be referred to it";⁹ the correspondence with colonial governors was monopolized by the secretary for the southern department, the governors sending only duplicates to the Board; the nomination of colonial officers—a privilege exercised by Halifax—had been lost in 1761; the power to make reports and representations on its own initiative had been taken away. From August, 1766, to January, 1768, the Board of Trade was in a less commanding position than it had been for many years, and colonial affairs were directly under the authority of the southern secretary. This gave the long-needed unity, but it also put overwhelming power in the hands of one man, who had authority over home affairs, Ireland, and foreign negotiations with the powers of southern Europe. For reasons of policy or politics or jealousy,¹⁰ Grafton, as prime minister, determined to create a separate American department; the Board of Trade simply transferred its business from the southern department to the new colonial department, and made its reports to Hillsborough rather than to Shelburne. Thus far the story is simple; the next step brings in an element of confusion.

The Board of Trade was composed of eight regular members, with the great officers of state as *ex officio* members. When Hillsborough became secretary of state in January no change was made in the commission of the Board, except that Hillsborough was added as an *ex officio* member; in July, however, the then president of the Board, Lord Clare, was dropped from the commission, leaving only seven regular members, and Hillsborough was ordered to attend regularly at the meetings of the Board. This was the reversal of the process advocated by Halifax. He wished the presidency of the Board to be raised to a secretaryship; Hillsborough as secretary became, for all practical purposes, the president of the Board. The greater office was not added to the lesser, but the greater absorbed the lesser, which, for a time, entirely disappeared. This chronological sequence of events has been generally overlooked, while William Knox, a keen if

⁹ Public Record Office, C. O. 5: 216, Hillsborough to Shelburne.

¹⁰ Fitzmaurice, *Shelburne*, I. 327 ff.

not unprejudiced observer, is authority for the statement that Hillsborough's colleagues looked upon him simply as first lord of trade (president of the Board) with seals and cabinet¹¹—an opinion that was to make it hard for Hillsborough and his successors to obtain a position equal to that of the other secretaries of state.

This dual position of the secretary makes it sometimes difficult to determine exactly in what capacity he was acting—whether as first lord of trade or as secretary of state. The Journals of the Board record the presence of “one of his Majesty’s principal secretaries of state” immediately below the names of the other members in attendance, thus emphasizing the secretarial character. In 1779 Germain said that he was no more a member of the Board of Trade than the Archbishop of Canterbury, but he gave himself away when he added that he sometimes attended as first lord.¹² A few months later, however, Germain was ready to insist upon his position as first lord in a matter of petty patronage, with the result that the Board recorded a minute that “the presence of the secretary of state for the American department being made indispensable by the terms of his Majesty’s commission . . . the privileges annexed to the first lord of trade for the time being should and ought to devolve upon the secretary of state.”¹³ This particular problem was solved in November, 1779, by a return to the old system of a regularly appointed first lord commissioner of trade and the separation of the Board from the colonial department.¹⁴ According to the king this would place Germain “in every respect on the same line as the two antient Secretaries”,¹⁵ but the king’s idea was to placate Germain for having lost a position at the Board rather than to relieve him of the suspicion of inferiority which that position entailed, or had entailed for his predecessors. Whatever may be our final conclusion in respect of the place of the colonial secretaries in the government, it is certain that they were more than first lords commissioners of trade with seals and seat in cabinet.

The appointment of Hillsborough and the establishment of a colonial department seem to have been opposed in the House of

¹¹ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Various Collections*, VI. 256 (Knox MSS.).

¹² *Parl. Hist.*, XX. 263, 266. Germain here falls into a curious error; he was certainly an ex officio member along with the other great officers of state: they were excused from attendance; he was not. Moreover the archbishop was not even an ex officio member, as was the Bishop of London. His interpretation of “occasionally” is also interesting; Germain missed only 17 out of 179 meetings of the Board in four years.

¹³ Public Record Office, C. O. 391: 86, pp. 139–140.

¹⁴ See the author’s note, “The Earl of Carlisle and the Board of Trade, 1779”, in this *Review*, XXII. 334–339.

¹⁵ Donne, *The Correspondence of George III. with Lord North*, II. 283.

Lords,¹⁶ but the extent of Hillsborough's jurisdiction seems never to have been brought into question. That there was jealousy and friction is shown, however, in connection with the appointment of his successor. On his resignation the vacant post was offered to Weymouth, who declined it on the ground that he had opposed the establishment in 1768, and that he thought it not a real secretaryship, because the form of its commission limited its efficiency to the colonies.¹⁷ This is based evidently on the preamble and indicates an informed contemporary interpretation of that preamble. The faction in the ministry opposed to North—Gower, Suffolk, and Rochford—was more than willing to discontinue the office, in which case the direction of the colonies would be given to the Board of Trade and the patronage would be once more in the hands of the southern secretary.¹⁸ The reluctant acceptance of the seals by the Earl of Dartmouth prevented such a return to the old scheme of divided authority. The delimiting, or explanatory, clauses were retained in his commission, but certain changes, suggested by the king himself, were made in matters of administrative detail in order to prevent conflict between the colonial and southern departments.¹⁹ The older secretaries, however, seemed determined to curtail Dartmouth's powers. They particularly denied his right to give orders to the Admiralty and to the secretary at war; these important functions were saved only by the persistence of John Pownall, who was able to find precedents to uphold Dartmouth's claims.²⁰ Ultimately a working agreement was made whereby Dartmouth should direct the movement of troops within the colonies and should give orders to the Admiralty in connection with the return of the troops from them, while all orders to the secretary at war or the Admiralty concerning the sending of troops thither should come from the older departments.²¹ Thus it would appear that very definite attempts were made to interfere with the freedom of action which by right belonged to a *bona fide* secretary

¹⁶ See below.

¹⁷ Walpole, *Last Journals*, I. 127; Knox MSS., *op. cit.*, 256.

¹⁸ Knox MSS., *op. cit.*, p. 256; p. 107, Pownall to Knox, August 1, 1777. Pownall thought both direction and patronage might be given to the Board, but this seems unlikely in view of the wish of Rochford to obtain the appointment to two colonial patent offices which were about to fall in.

¹⁹ George III. to North, Aug. 9, 1772, Donne, *op. cit.*, I. 107. What these changes were does not appear.

²⁰ John Pownall, secretary of the Board of Trade and under-secretary of state. Knox was his colleague in the latter position.

²¹ Public Record Office, St. Pap. Dom., M 1, 26. *Cal. St. P. Home Office*, IV. no. 79.

of state, and that it was only by the exercise of considerable adroitness that even routine business was performed by the Colonial Office.

Dartmouth was not the kind of man to carry on such constant bickering as was necessary, and in fact he made little impression either upon the Council or upon the Board of Trade. Pownall complained to his colleague, Knox, that Bamber Gascoyne²² was "minister for America at the board and Lord Suffolk at the council office, all councils for American business being in Lord Gower's absence held by Lord Suffolk. . . . Lord North's blindness, or rather indolence, in respect to the arts that are practised to ruin and disgrace our department, and ultimately himself, is astonishing and unpardonable".²³ Dartmouth was too trustful and lacking in force, North was too good-natured to deal with the aggressive faction in the cabinet. The fact that these two men were step-brothers and had long lived on terms of intimacy did not save the American department from cutting a "most pitiful figure" or prevent Suffolk from getting so much American business in his hands that Pownall complained that William Eden, Suffolk's under-secretary, knew more about the colonies than he did.²⁴ When we remember that these years, 1772-1775, were the most critical in all the history of the American colonies, we can understand how important were these internal divisions and jealousies.

The resignation of Dartmouth in November, 1775, due to his unwillingness to direct hostilities against the colonies then in actual revolt, furnished an opportunity for the ambitious Suffolk to increase his power in the cabinet. The government was but a patched-up affair: Gower was the leader of the old Bedford group, Suffolk of the disrupted Grenvillites, and both hoped to displace the premier. The changes made in 1775 were designed to satisfy all factions: Dartmouth took the Privy Seal, Rochford gave way to Weymouth, a Bedfordite, and Lord George Germain, a Grenvillite, succeeded Dartmouth. The accession of Germain added strength, or at least aggressiveness, to the government; his military experience, unfortunate as it had been, was presumed to fit him to direct the campaign in America, and his ability as a speaker aided the government in the Commons, where its leadership was lamentably weak. It was Suffolk, however, who hoped to profit most from Germain's appointment: without giving up any of the business he had usurped and without recognizing Germain as a secretary of state with full power,

²² A member of the Board of Trade.

²³ Knox MSS., *op. cit.*, p. 110, July 23, 1773, Pownall to Knox.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 122, Oct. 10, 1775, Pownall to Knox.

he would gain a colleague who would support him in his intrigues against North.

Suffolk's plan miscarried. The commission issued to Hillsborough and Dartmouth, as we have seen, was different from the commissions to the other secretaries of state only in the matter of the preamble; so long as this was retained, however, the interpretation might be made that this commission created a new office; if this were true, Germain, as a commoner, could not, according to the Place Acts of Anne, hold such an office. Hillsborough and Dartmouth as peers had naturally not been affected by this consideration. The only recourse, therefore, was to issue a warrant and commission in such form as those issued to the other secretaries of state; in other words, the preamble should be omitted. Were this done, then certainly one of the main arguments in favor of a distinction between the powers of the old and new departments would be gone—and Suffolk would gain nothing.

The first thought seemed to be to fall back upon the argument that a third secretary of state could not be legally created. In the Auckland MSS., in the papers dealing with this affair and among the letters of Eden and Wedderburn, there is an unsigned and undated summary of a "debate which arose at the end of the session in which Lord H[illsborough] was appointed secretary".²⁵ The arguments were wholly against the legality or expediency of a third secretary of state. Such an office is illegal, it was said, because (1) of the custom of the constitution, there having been only two secretaries since the time of Henry VIII., the exception of a Scottish secretary not being germane,²⁶ (2) of the provisions of the Regency Act, which provided for only two secretaries and thus implied the impossibility of a third, (3) of the Place Acts of Anne, and (4) if a third secretaryship of state could be created, so could a fourth and a fifth, and, likewise, all the great offices of state might be multiplied; furthermore such an office is inexpedient because of "the impropriety of making America a distinct department, separating it still more from Great Britain by erecting a peculiar office for affairs there"; it is improper because of the Board of Trade, which

could not be an office of government, for the government of the colonies must be carried on by the king in council; there could not be two

²⁵ British Museum, Add. MSS. 34,412, ff. 393-395. This manuscript is undoubtedly in the handwriting of Wedderburn. If he believed in the validity of the case as here presented, he did not let that fact influence his conduct as will soon appear.

²⁶ The manuscript points out that after the debate was over, it was learned that there was a third secretary in the reign of Edward VI.—a point in favor of the constitutionality.

councils, and it was more improper to make the first commissioner of trade a secretary for the colonies than any other of the king's servants, because having a board to support him, he would naturally assume to decide where his province only was to report;²⁷ and must, by degrees raise, if he could, his board above the council and hold himself without control in his new made department.

Although this purports to be a summary of a debate held some nine years before, nevertheless it must have been the basis upon which Suffolk and his friends hoped to rest their case.

When the time came for Germain, along with Weymouth (the successor of Rochford), to take his oath of office, the question in respect both of the legality of his office and the form of his commission was still unsettled. The story at this point may best be told in the words of William Knox:

A difficulty in giving Lord George Germain such a commission, 'twas apprehended, would be made by Lord Weymouth and Lord Suffolk. Lord Suffolk, we supposed, would acquiesce for the sake of his plan and with him the Solicitor General would concur. The Attorney General²⁸ and Lord Weymouth were supposed to object together. The King by one of those minute strokes for which he is so eminent, removed all the difficulty. When the Council was met to swear in the new officers, Lord Gower, being Lord President, moved the King, of course, that Lord Weymouth might be sworn Secretary of State. The King replied, "there are two secretaries to be sworn; let them be sworn together", which was done accordingly.²⁹

This decisive action on the part of the king ought to have put a definite end to the whole intrigue. Not so: the commission had to be drawn up in Suffolk's office,³⁰ and thus Suffolk and Eden were given an opportunity for more bickering.

Germain, as was customary, entered upon the duties of his office without waiting for the enrolment of his formal commission, and immediately trouble-makers appeared. Germain's friends, it was alleged, desired "to raise his department"³¹ above the other two,

²⁷ It is interesting to note in this connection the reason for the resignation of Hillsborough as secretary of state. The council refused to adopt the policy recommended by the Board of Trade in connection with the Ohio grants. Hillsborough was, of course, responsible for the proposals of the Board. Thus it was because his policy at the Board rather than his policy as secretary of state was defeated that he resigned.

²⁸ The solicitor general was Wedderburn; the attorney general, Thurlow.

²⁹ Knox MSS., *op. cit.*, p. 256.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 257.

³¹ Add. MSS. 34,412, f. 390. Eden to [Wedderburn], Dec. 16, 1775. Eden seems to have been sincerely worried, for he wrote: ". . . in the meantime I know that, what you cannot know or conceive, if the American department is

while Eden and Suffolk were determined to prevent any such possibility, or even the appearance of an equality among the three departments, by drawing up a "barrier treaty" between Cleveland Row and Whitehall.³² Eden drew up such a "barrier treaty", duplicates of which were to be signed at the top and bottom by the king³³ and were to be sent to each one of the three secretaries; this document was drawn up in the first person as from the king, and recited that orders had been given for a warrant to Germain "in the same form and manner" as for the northern and southern secretaries, but that it was necessary in order to obviate any inconveniences which might arise in the course of business that the form of the warrant and commission should make

no difference with regard to the duties of the third Secretary of State who is always to be considered as separate from the other two; and that the ministers filling the Northern and Southern departments shall in all events be considered . . . as the two principal Secretaries of State at whatever period they may be appointed. And farther, it is my pleasure that my Secretaries for the Northern and Southern departments shall exclusively as heretofore transact all business respecting the interior of Great Britain, or any other parts of my domain, and all other matters which have been executed within the said departments subsequent to Lord Hillsborough and Lord Dartmouth being made Secretaries of State. And it is equally my pleasure that my Secretary of State for the Colonies shall transact all matters in his department in the same manner as has been hitherto done by his predecessors therein.³⁴

This proposed sign-manual instruction was shown to Wedderburn, who had gradually drawn away from Suffolk and had become the to be blended with them in the manner that you wish and propose, it will be the only honorable one of the three; the others will become irksome and inconvenient and will end in being insignificant and disgraceful. . . . Why will not Lord George's advocates *since* he came into office speak out when they counteract those who were his most active friends before he came into office. They intimate that they wish to alter the form of the appointment without changing the functions. 'Be it so', we say, 'let the appointment differ from his predecessors, but let the functions remain the same'. 'No', they say, 'that line is dangerous, and we cannot advise him to be guided by it without misleading him from his honour and his interest'".

³² *Ibid.*, f. 397, Dec. 17, 1775. The colonial department was in Whitehall—Downing street; Suffolk's office was in Cleveland Row.

³³ In other words, this document was in the form of a sign-manual instruction.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 392–393. This draft is in Eden's hand. He wrote Wedderburn that Suffolk approved it. In so far as this draft throws any light upon the conduct of the colonial department under Hillsborough and Dartmouth, it would appear that neither of these men were regarded as of equal rank or authority with the other secretaries; that the preamble of their commissions was looked upon as definitely limiting their power to the colonies. All the other evidence seems to point in the same direction, and we may therefore conclude that neither Hillsborough nor Dartmouth possessed the full and extensive power of the secretarial seals.

friend and adviser of Germain. Wedderburn not only refused to show Germain this proposal, but said that he would advise him to resign rather than to

submit to an explanation not called for, not attempted on two former occasions, and that can only be proposed . . . to make him submit in the first place to an indignity and afterwards hold the exercise of his office at the discretion of the other offices and at his own risque; for to give as a fixed rule the usage of seven or eight years is only establishing a rule the extent of which is to be disputed in every case and which by the power of two to one will be decided for his office when the act is troublesome, against it when it is unpleasant.³⁵

Eden insisted, nevertheless, that "some barrier treaty must subsist between the departments in the very nature of their establishment", and believed that his scheme, "unless Lord George much misapprehends it", ought to be satisfactory, both because Germain "knows enough of this kind of business to know that some line ought to be drawn", and because "his mind is too honorable not to feel that the terms used in describing that line ought to be general and indefinite that they may be liberally interpreted for the care and advantage of the public service". In the meantime Eden had talked with John Pownall. "If he (Pownall) can have the same success with his principal (Germain) I shall hope to see this silly story put an end to tomorrow", wrote Eden. He was all the more willing to stop his intrigues because of bad news which had just arrived from America, and which made him indisposed to stick at punctilios of office or to do anything for private reasons to "clog and embarrass the wheels of government".³⁶ Evidently Pownall had no success with his chief, because nothing more is heard of this astounding proposal. In fact the commission was duly made out and enrolled, with the preamble left out.³⁷ Germain was, therefore, technically on the same plane with the other secretaries; his commission was the same; his continuance in office as a commoner signified that the colonial secretaryship was not regarded as a *new* office for which, according to the Place Acts, a commoner would be ineligible.³⁸

³⁵ Add. MSS. 34,412, f. 398, Wedderburn to Eden, Dec. 18, 1775.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 397.

³⁷ Public Record Office, Patent Rolls, 16 George III., pt. 2, memb. 4. The patent for Germain's successor, Welbore Ellis—the last colonial secretary of this period—is in the same form: Patent Rolls, 22 George III., memb. 10.

³⁸ Germain had one more skirmish in connection with this whole matter. In 1779 Sir Joseph Mawbey raised the question of Germain's eligibility to sit in the Commons, on the ground that he occupied an office established after October, 1705. The stock arguments were used, to which Germain replied that he had gone into the matter at the time of his appointment, that he had understood that

Although this whole discussion is inconclusive, several things stand out so prominently as to throw some light on the development of the secretariat. In the first place, the query in respect of the constitutionality of a third secretaryship was answered by the mere fact of the creation and continuance of the office. In the second place, it seems certain that Hillsborough and Dartmouth were considered as and acted only as *colonial* secretaries; without the ulterior question being raised as to their general powers, they accepted an informal restriction upon the theoretically all-embracing power of the secretarial seal. In the third place, and most interesting of all, the question arises: what if Eden's barrier treaty had been accepted? The theory of the secretariat which was laid down at the beginning of this paper would have received a rude blow, and one of the main lines of the development of the cabinet might well have been blocked. Although his contention received no recognition in the wording of Burke's bill which disestablished the old colonial secretaryship, Germain was fighting a battle for the future when he insisted that he was not a *third* secretary or a secretary for the *colonies*, but one of his Majesty's principal secretaries of state.

ARTHUR HERBERT BASYE.

his office was not a new one, and that he had complied with the Place Acts by standing for re-election. The house divided, but only one member supported Mawbey and his second. *Parl. Hist.*, XX. 250-266.

THE AMERICAN GRAIN TRADE TO THE SPANISH PENINSULA, 1810-1814

ENGLAND'S dependency upon American food supplies is by no means of recent date. Colonial and Revolutionary times abound with evidences of British demand for wheat and flour from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York. The importance, however, of American grain in English history presented itself for the first time during the Napoleonic era.¹ In 1807 Murray, United States consul at Liverpool, remarked in a consular despatch that "such quantities of wheat and flour from the United States have lately poured into this market that prices have declined. . . ." ² A year later Mr. Cropper, a leading corn merchant of London, testified before a parliamentary committee that the trade of that city had decreased considerably since the passage of the American Embargo.³ Several years later, Brougham declared in Parliament in the course of his speech on the economic distress of England, ". . . Sire, have you not taken away the only remedy for this scarcity; the only relief to which we can now look under a bad harvest—by closing the corn market of America."⁴

What was true of England was equally true of her numerous possessions and colonies. In no place was the dependency upon

¹ Prior to the Napoleonic era, the grain trade to England had never assumed great importance. The closing up of Europe by reason of the war with France compelled the English to seek supplies in the United States. The following table discloses the growth of American exports of grain and flour to England:

	Bushels		Bushels
1800	725,527	1808	105,654
1801	2,977,201	1809	1,383,028
1802	646,554	1810	786,889
1803	878,654	1811	144,779
1804	34,808	1812	92,189
1805	107,806	1813	8,742
1806	639,248	1814	12
1807	2,006,920		

Of this wheat and flour amounted to 88 per cent., Indian corn to 7 per cent., beans, pease, barley, rye, and oats to 5 per cent. *Parl. Papers*, 1825-1826, no. 227. In the British source, quantities are given in "quarters", a quarter equalling eight bushels. I have merely reduced the quarters to bushels.

² Consular Despatches, Liverpool, July 23, 1807, State Department, Washington, D.C.

³ *Parl. Pap.*, 1808, no. 118, pp. 70-71; *Parl. Debates*, XII. 35, 376, 780; *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, Feb. 19, 1809.

⁴ *Parl. Debates*, XXIII. 492, 496; see also XXII. 435, 438, 1095.

American grain more pronounced than among the British forces stationed in Spain and Portugal. In consequence of the occupation of the Peninsula by British troops grain exports from the United States to Spain grew by leaps and bounds.⁵ Prices, frequently double those which were offered in American or English markets, spurred the American farmer and merchant to greater and still greater efforts. "Letters from Lisbon", reported Josiah Faxon of Virginia to his client Andrew Clopper of Boston, "of a recent date quote it [flour] at \$12.50 per barrel and advancing. This advance has caused a considerable advance in prices here. It could this evening be bought for \$7.50 cash."⁶

Throughout the summer and fall of 1810 and 1811, unprecedented quantities of wheat and flour were shipped to the Peninsula. The greater share of these supplies was intended for the English armies.⁷ British agents openly purchased grain and flour in the United States for direct shipment to Spain and Portugal.⁸ Early in 1812, Foster, the British minister at Washington, received from Stuart, English commissary officer at Lisbon, £304,881 for the purchase of corn and flour.⁹

⁵ Flour (barrels):

	Spain	Portugal		Spain	Portugal
1800	2,550	5,333	1808	30,449	41,761
1801	11,079	43,612	1809	40,047	65,149
1802	59,409	85,784	1810	144,436	88,696
1803	144,935	122,410	1811	306,074	529,105
1804	109,906	54,648	1812	381,726	557,218
1805	103,646	22,633	1813	430,101	542,399
1806	19,196	91,273	1814	221	4,141
1807	39,842	76,352	1815	67,866	47,163

Timothy Pitkin, *A Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States* (New Haven, 1835), pp. 119, 120.

⁶ Faxon Letter Book, May 18, 1810, Faxon Letter Books, MS., New York Public Library. Josiah Faxon was an important grain merchant of Virginia.

⁷ "The flour now shipping goes to supply the British armies", Faxon to Clopper, June 13, 1810.

⁸ The Original Précis Books of Marquis Wellesley, his secret and official correspondence with the American government when foreign secretary (2 vols. MS., New York Public Library), May 9, 1811. Out of 759 ships that entered Lisbon from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1811, 284 were American, laden chiefly with grain and flour from Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Alexandria, and New York; see Board of Trade Papers, 1: 62, Stuart's Report on Imports into Lisbon, June 30 to Dec. 31, 1811. See also B.T. 1: 79, Castlereagh to the Board of Trade, July 7, 1813.

⁹ Foreign Office Papers, 95: 31, Foster to Castlereagh, Feb. 27, 1812. These purchases were temporarily checked by the Embargo, but at a later date completed; F.O. 95: 31, Foster to Castlereagh, Apr. 23, 1812, Baker to Castlereagh, Dec. 18, 1812.

It was the usual practice of American shippers to load their produce in New England bottoms and order them direct to Lisbon or Cadiz. When the fortune of war closed these ports, other cities were designated either in the Peninsula or in the British Isles. The supercargo, who acted as the agent for the shipper, obtained in payment British governmental bills, which he handed over to some respectable business house of London or Liverpool to be placed to the credit of the American shipper. This method is admirably disclosed in the following letter of the Virginian firm of Lawarson and Foule to Captain Lawarson:

We have shipped you on board the Schooner *Susan* under your command, 481 barrels flour addressed to Messers Gould Brothers of Lisbon, which you will deliver to them agreeable to the bill of lading. But should it so happen that the French is in possession of Lisbon and you can not enter there you will proceed to Cadiz and if that also should be in the possession of the French you will go to Gibraltar, and at either place should you be prevented from going into Lisbon, you will dispose of the flour on the best terms you can and remit the proceeds in Government Bills only, to Henry Higgenson, Esq. of London to be placed to the credit and subject to the order of Samuel Smith Esq. of Boston. In the event of your not being able to go to either places named, you will have to proceed to Liverpool in which case you advise with Mr. Higgenson respecting the sale of flour.¹⁰

So extensive did this trade become that Foster was of the opinion that the American government would ultimately be forced to revoke the Non-Importation Act "as the middle states are obtaining very great profit on their flour in Portugal and Spain, which always brings them a great importation of bullion from the British domain in exchange for their produce".¹¹ It is possible that Foster hoped by such a statement to temper the belligerent attitude of his government toward America, and thus pave the way for an amicable settlement of the problems then confronting both nations. There is no evidence, however, to indicate that Madison ever contemplated the repeal of the Non-Importation Act for the reason suggested by Foster. And even had the act been withdrawn it is extremely doubtful whether it would have altered the foreign policies of either nation. Relations between the two were steadily becoming more and more critical. Continued short-sightedness on the part of the English, as well as a lack of willingness on the part of the American to understand the Englishman's point of view, produced at length a serious crisis. By the spring of 1812, war appeared inevitable.

¹⁰ Lawarson and Foule to Capt. Lawarson, Mar. 6, 1811; see also their letter to Capt. Davidson, July 20, 1811. Lawarson and Foule Letter Books, MS., New York Public Library.

¹¹ Précis Books, July 7, 1811.

At once a mad scramble ensued among the shippers to clear American harbors before either an embargo or a war was declared. On the very day that Madison's proposal for an embargo reached Congress, Lawarson and Foule addressed their client Rich: "We are loading the *Huntress* as fast as possible, shall not break off tonight. Whether we can effect our object is very uncertain as the doors of Congress are now closed upon the Embargo question, and it is supposed will pass. We yet hope there is a sufficiency of honest men in the House to defeat the infamous intention of the present governing party."¹² To another client, they wrote, "We have had no rest for 28 hours, and are completely worn out. Have got all our vessels away, the last the Ship *Huntress* with 5,000 barrels sailed a few hours since."¹³

The opposition on the part of the farmer and grain merchant, as expressed in these letters, to the foreign policy of the administration was most pronounced. At Washington their cause was warmly championed by John Randolph, who bitterly condemned the government for suggesting an embargo, so injurious to the farmers and so productive of great speculations. Further, he openly accused Madison of having yielded to French influence and insisted that "... to his certain knowledge ... the French Minister, M. Serrurier, ever since his arrival here, had been pressing our Government to prohibit the exportation of our products to the Peninsula".¹⁴ In spite of this and other speeches of protest the Embargo passed and was followed a few days later by a declaration of war against Great Britain.

Disappointed, but by no means discouraged, over the unfortunate turn in events, the American shipper viewed the future with less apprehension than might have been expected. Previous experience with British orders and American embargoes had impressed upon him the fact that there existed numerous methods whereby the restrictive

¹² Lawarson and Foule to Rich, Apr. 1, 1812.

¹³ Lawarson and Foule to Smith, Apr. 6, 1812; Foster reported that "almost incredible expedition" had been used, over 140 vessels having left New York with supplies for the Peninsula in one week, while 20,000 barrels of flour had left Richmond for the same place during a similar space of time; F.O. 95: 31, Foster to Castlereagh, Apr. 23, 1812. See also *Boston Gazette*, Apr. 20, 1812.

¹⁴ *Annals of Congress*, 12 Cong., 1 sess., pt. 2, p. 1590. Nothing has been found in the *Letters and other Writings of James Madison* (Philadelphia, 1865), the Madison MSS. in the New York Public Library, or the numerous contemporary sources used in this article, to substantiate Randolph's accusation. It is very likely that Serrurier may have attempted to influence Madison to check the Spanish trade. Writing to Castlereagh, May 4, 1812, Foster reported that it had been clearly ascertained that the motive prompting the Embargo had been the desire to produce distress in the Peninsula. F.O. 95: 31. See also *Providence Gazette*, Feb. 23, 1811.

features of these measures might be evaded. In former times British licenses and Jeffersonian certificates had protected his goods and had gained for him handsome profits. It was, therefore, not unusual for Lawarson and Foule to receive numerous inquiries from their patrons relative to the existence of British licenses.¹⁵ At once, Foule visited the British minister. Although Foster possessed no definite information, he believed that it was very "probable that some arrangement will yet be made".¹⁶ Crowding this interesting information came more valuable news to the effect that several firms were loading vessels for southern Europe. What assurance these concerns possessed that their ships would be immune from capture, Lawarson and Foule were unable to ascertain. It was rumored that the entire grain fleet would be convoyed—by whom, no one knew. Another informant declared that the English government would protect all vessels flying the Portuguese or Spanish flags.¹⁷ Determined to probe the matter still further, Foule personally visited the Spanish consul who informed him "that he was authorized to purchase provisions on government account, or in other words if the property was transferred to him or a Spanish subject, he would grant such papers as would protect the property from capture by the British".¹⁸ Here then was a definite offer, and Foule lost no time in forwarding this welcome news to his clients for their consideration.

Close upon the heels of this, came the more welcome intelligence that the British government had issued licenses for an unlimited trade to southern Europe.¹⁹ Immediately American harbors swarmed with vessels seeking cargoes for Spain and Portugal. The effect on the grain market was most pronounced. In July, flour had sold for \$6.25 a barrel; by August the price had advanced to \$8.00, and by the close of September it had reached the height of \$10.50. This is to be explained, in part, by the drought of the summer. A more important cause, however, existed in the sudden increased demand made upon

¹⁵ Lawarson and Foule to Rich, June 29, 1812; see their letter to Rollins, June 22, 1812.

¹⁶ Lawarson and Foule to Rich and Rollins, June 29, 1812.

¹⁷ Lawarson and Foule to Pearson, Crowensfield, and Rich, July 2, 4, and 8, 1812, respectively.

¹⁸ Lawarson and Foule to Goodwin and 16 others, July 24, 1812. There is evidence to prove that Spanish licenses were issued and used, but the British government held them to be of no legal effect; see B.T. 5: 22, Apr. 12, 1813, and the letter from Stuart to the Foreign Office, Nov. 14, 1812, enclosed in a communication from the Foreign Office, Dec. 2, 1812, to the Privy Council, to be found among the Unbound Papers in the Privy Council Office, Whitehall.

¹⁹ Lawarson and Foule to Baker, Sept. 4, 1812; see also Faxon to Baxter, Sept. 4, 1812.

the market by reason of the commonly accepted rumor of a British license trade. On the other hand, there seems to have been some doubt on the part of a few merchants as to whether these licenses were going to be issued after all. Faxon, writing to Baxter, September 30, 1812, stated: "We are yet in doubt about the British protecting . . . any vessels bound to or from Cadiz or Lisbon. Probably it may be so."

Indeed it was so. Hardly had the news reached England that America had declared war, when several commercial houses petitioned the Board of Trade for licenses to engage in the grain trade between the United States and the Peninsula.²⁰ On the same day that this information was forwarded to America, the Privy Council instructed the advocate general to prepare the draft of a license protecting American vessels proceeding from the United States with grain and flour to Cadiz or Lisbon, and returning in ballast to any unblockaded port of the United States.²¹ That these were straightway issued is evidenced from the following: "The licenses which I recently stated had been applied for to protect vessels with provisions from the United States to Lisbon or Cadiz have been granted for the term of nine months."²² It is possible that some licenses were issued before this, as an Order in Council, July 31, 1812, exempted from capture only such American vessels "as may be furnished with British licenses, which vessels are allowed to proceed according to the tenor of the said licenses."²³ It is more probable, however, that this order had been issued with a view to regulate the American trade in general, or possibly it had reference to the licenses granted by Foster, whose action the government may have anticipated.

In any event, prior to the above-mentioned order, Foster on his own responsibility, while still in America, had undertaken to license the grain trade to the Peninsula. His motive in doing this was to insure the satisfactory completion of the instructions sent him, shortly

²⁰ Department of State, Consular Despatches, London, Aug. 3, 1812.

²¹ Privy Council Unbound Papers, Aug. 3, 1812. At a later date American ships were permitted to return to any unblockaded port in America with cargoes of lawful merchandise of the Peninsula. This policy was adopted for a threefold reason: first, to encourage the shipment of grain; secondly, to aid the merchants of the Peninsula; and thirdly, to prevent the payment in specie, which, it will be recalled, was a very important problem then facing the English government; see Order in Council, Oct. 13, 1812; B.T. 1: 71, Stuart to Castlereagh, Nov. 21, 1812; also B.T. 5: 22, Dec. 8, 1812, and B.T. 5: 21, Oct. 12, 1812.

²² Consular Despatches, London, Aug. 14, 1812; see also B.T. 5: 21, Aug. 21, 1812, and London *Daily Times*, Aug. 12, 1812.

²³ All references to Orders in Council in this article are to be found in the Privy Council Register, Public Record Office, London.

before, by Stuart.²⁴ Accordingly, upon his departure in June, 1812, 180 licenses duly numbered, together with five others that had been granted to particular individuals, were left in the hands of Baker, Foster's assistant, who was to remain for a short time in Washington. Information relative to these licenses was forwarded to Stuart so as to anticipate any misunderstandings; while Admiral Sawyer, similarly advised, agreed not to molest any vessels so licensed.²⁵ These Foster licenses protected ships sailing under the American, Portuguese, Swedish, or Spanish flags.²⁶

Neither the authority nor the practice of the Board of Trade in issuing licenses was disputed. There was, however, considerable doubt as to whether Foster possessed this right or power. That he had issued these certificates was not questioned; their validity, however, was questioned. American ships possessing these licenses were captured by both American and British privateers, the latter doubting the reliability of the licenses.²⁷ To obviate further capture by English vessels, the British government issued an Order in Council, in which it expressly approved of and gave authority to all licenses granted by Foster for the Spanish trade.²⁸

In addition to the Foster licenses, the "Sidmouths", and "Prince Regents", as those of the Board of Trade were termed, there appeared still another species in the form of certificates issued in America by Admiral Sawyer, Consul Allen of Boston and New York,

²⁴ See *ante*, p. 25.

²⁵ Admiral Sawyer was in command of the British squadron stationed at Halifax. Among the Privy Council Unbound Papers there is a letter from the Foreign Office, Aug. 25, 1812, enclosing Foster's letter to Castlereagh, dated London, Aug. 25, 1812. In addition Foster stated that he had issued 30 passports for the West Indies, and 18 others for cargoes of pitch, pine, and timber for Liverpool.

²⁶ By the middle of July, 60 Foster licenses had been issued, probably to Messrs. Sompayo and Wood, who were under contract to supply the British troops in the Peninsula. Later 19 more were issued, and two were destroyed as useless; none appear to have been issued after Dec. 18, 1812 (see B.T. 5: 21, Aug. 21, 1812; F.O. 95: 31, Baker to Castlereagh, Bermuda, Mar. 22, 1813). Stuart reported early in 1813 that out of a total of 693 ships that had entered Lisbon for the last half of 1812, 235 were American vessels laden with corn and flour; of these, 21 were under foreign flags, 18 Portuguese, 2 Spanish, and 1 Papenburger. B.T. 1: 73.

²⁷ *Boston Independent Chronicle*, July 30, 1812; *National Intelligencer*, July 28, 1812.

²⁸ This order does not appear in the *London Gazette*, but is to be found in the Privy Council Register, Oct. 13, 1812. Foster's action was warmly indorsed by Wellington, see *Despatches of Wellington*, IX. 395. The Board of Trade stated that it did not presume "to convey the slightest degree of censure", on the contrary thought him "entitled to commendation", B.T. 5: 21, Aug. 21, 1812.

and Consul Stewart of New London. Those granted by Admiral Sawyer appear to have been few in number and to have permitted American ships to transport grain and flour from the United States to the Peninsula. Immunity from capture was limited by these licenses to vessels stopped by one of Sawyer's own squadron. They did not prevent any other British ship from seizing the same as lawful prize.²⁹ This was a manifest inconsistency, and the Privy Council hastened to declare by order, October 26, 1812, that any American vessel possessing a Sawyer license was exempt from capture by any or all of His Majesty's navy. In addition the order extended the immunity enjoyed by the license to the voyage from America to the Peninsula and back.³⁰

Before this measure had made its appearance the British consul Allen had written Sawyer, July 19, 1812, with a view of obtaining his approval for the issuing of licenses in New York for the Spanish and West Indian trade. Sawyer's answer permitted Allen, under his consular seal, to license vessels for the Spanish trade on the same terms as stated in his own licenses.³¹ Allen, accordingly, proceeded to grant protection not only from Sawyer's squadron but from any British vessel—an immunity which was extended to the voyage going and returning. This in itself was an illegal departure from the instructions that he had received from Sawyer, a departure that was held valid, at a later date, by the Admiralty.³²

Before the Admiralty had taken this position, the *Hope*, bound from Philadelphia to Corunna with a cargo of grain, protected by a Sawyer-Allen license, was captured on the high seas and brought into port for trial. The decision in this case was rendered by Sir William Scott. Scott maintained: first, that neither Sawyer nor Allen possessed any power to grant licenses; but, secondly, that the British government had indorsed their actions by the Orders in Council of October 13 and 26, 1812; and thirdly, that in view of these orders, the ship and its cargo should be returned to the owner, subject to the

²⁹ Sawyer informed Croker, secretary to the Admiralty, Aug. 6, 1812, that he had granted 20 papers to Mr. Robert Elwell of Boston for the Peninsular trade. Privy Council Unbound Papers, letter from the Admiralty, Oct. 24, 1812; see also Admiralty Papers, 1: 502, f. 441.

³⁰ This order does not appear in the *London Gazette*, but is to be found in the Privy Council Register for 1812. Professor Channing in his *History of the United States*, IV. 532 (1917), states that the Sawyer licenses permitted trade with Canada. A study of the sources used in this article would indicate that these licenses were granted for the Spanish trade.

³¹ Admiralty Papers, 1: 502, f. 420, Aug. 5, 1812. See *National Intelligencer*, Mar. 6, 1813, for a copy of Allen's licenses, also *Richmond Enquirer*, Mar. 5, 1813.

³² 1 Dodson, 225-233, case of the *Hope*.

payment of the captor's expenses. According to this decision, therefore, any vessel having either a Sawyer or an Allen license was granted a free and safe passage from the United States to the Peninsula and back.³³

The natural confusion likely to arise from a continuance of the use of Sawyer and Allen licenses cautioned the ministry to instruct Allen to grant no more licenses. It administered, furthermore, a sharp reprimand for his having done so "without authority and in a manner derogatory to the character of a person holding His Majesty's Commission" and requested him to inform the government of the full circumstances connected with his actions.³⁴ In response Allen stated that upon the first receipt of intelligence of the Board of Trade licenses, he had stopped issuing certificates. All in all, over two hundred licenses had been granted, chiefly to merchants of Boston, and those unused had, with few exceptions, been revoked by the middle of October. Allen further stated that each and every license so issued had been granted according to the permission given him by Sawyer. By way of proof, Allen submitted eight distinct affidavits signed by some very prominent Bostonians to the effect that they had been recipients of Allen's certificates.³⁵

Not only was Allen treated somewhat sternly by his own country, but he was rather harshly handled by some Americans. In the summer of 1813 he was brought to trial before a Boston court for having issued licenses contrary to the act of July 6, 1812. After spending some time in custody in Worcester, "a miserable country town", Allen managed to escape to Quebec and sailed from there to England.³⁶ Relative to Stewart's licenses, no order or judicial decision

³³ 1 Dodson, 225-233. News of this decision reached America in April, 1813; see *Columbian Centinel*, Apr. 14, 1813. The principles stated by Scott were substantially confirmed by the Lords of Appeal in the case of the *Reward*, July 9, 1814, appealed from the sentence of the Admiralty Court at Halifax relative to the effect of Sawyer's licenses in the form presented in the case of the *Hope*; see appendix D to 1 Dodson. It is interesting to note that the Privy Council held Allen's licenses of no legal value, Privy Council Unbound Papers, Council Minute, Dec. 7, 1812, and letter to Croker, Dec. 8, 1812. This was before the court had rendered its decision in the case of the *Hope* (Feb. 19, 1813). After this decision, the Council stated that the validity of each license would be decided by the Admiralty as cases presented themselves; see B.T. 5: 22, Apr. 12, 1813.

³⁴ B.T. 1: 70 contains a letter to Allen from the Foreign Office of Nov. 9, 1812; F.O. 5: 89, to Consul Allen, Nov. 25, 1812. Somewhat earlier Sawyer had been instructed to grant no more licenses; see Privy Council Unbound Papers, Bathurst to Croker, Oct. 26, 1812.

³⁵ Allen to Hamilton and Castlereagh, Feb. 3 and Apr. 15, 1813, respectively. F.O. 5: 95.

³⁶ Barclay MSS., New York Historical Society: Allen to Barclay, Sept. 14, 1813; Mr. Joel Thompson of Boston to Barclay, Dec. 11, 28, 1813; Mr. Simpson

appears to have been issued. The number granted by Stewart probably did not exceed the thirty which had been left in his hands by Foster prior to his departure from America. These licenses, furthermore, were limited to the West Indian trade. In view of these facts the Privy Council informed the Admiralty that those vessels already captured should not be released, but that in cases where no fraud appeared, the Admiralty should respect such licenses in the future.³⁷

The demand for these various licenses was enormous. No less than five hundred had been issued by the close of August, 1812.³⁸ They were openly bought and sold at New York, Alexandria, Boston, and elsewhere. As their numbers increased their market value decreased. In October, Lawarson and Foule reported that the "Prince Regent's licenses are getting plenty and cheap, say 500 or less", while in December they sold for \$400.³⁹ So numerous did they become that considerable doubt was cast upon their genuineness. "We received your favor with the license . . . we observe that there are counterfeits abroad, will you have the goodness to ascertain if this is genuine."⁴⁰ A similar statement appeared in *Niles' Register* for December 19, 1812: "For many years the British have been in the habit of *manufacturing* our shipping papers. *Our folks* are returning the compliment, and are daily engaged in making *British* licenses, to trade to Spain, Portugal, St. Bartholomews, etc." A week later the same paper stated: "In our last was inserted an article respecting the forgery of *British licenses*. The maker of them has been caught in New-York, with a large stock on hand."⁴¹ By whom or for what reason we are not informed. It is highly probable that the seizure was made by governmental officials on the assumption that the entire trade with the enemy was illegal.⁴²

of Boston to Barclay, Oct. 7, 14, 1813. Barclay for a long time was consul general at New York.

³⁷ Privy Council Unbound Papers; to Croker, Nov. 20, 1812. Stewart was also directed to grant no more licenses; B.T. 1: 70, Foster to Hamilton, Nov. 8, 1812, see also the indorsement on Foster's letter. James Stewart was British consul at New London, Conn. His career as a license-issuer was abruptly terminated by his arrest June, 1813; for further details see Barclay MSS., letters of Stewart to Barclay, especially those of June 28, July 3, and Oct. 8, 1813, and letter of Robert Fairchild to Madison, Jan. 3, 1814, Madison MSS., New York Public Library.

³⁸ Consular Despatches, London, Aug. 29, 1812; see *Boston Gazette*, Jan. 25, 1813.

³⁹ Lawarson and Foule to Dodge, Oct. 26, 1812.

⁴⁰ Lawarson and Foule to Appleton, Dec. 14, 1812.

⁴¹ *Niles' Register*, III. 256, 272.

⁴² Examination of New York newspapers, the correspondence of the period, and the other sources quoted in this article, fails to disclose any further information.

Public opinion, it appears, was at first uncertain as to the ethics of using British licenses. The existence of war, it was declared, had outlawed all commercial activities with England. But what, one asked, of the trade to Spain and Portugal? These were neutral states occupied for the time being by British troops, assisting Spain in her war for independence against the hated Napoleonic despotism. Had America forgotten so soon the aid rendered us by Spain during our war for freedom? Fearful, however, as to the strength of this sentimental argument, the merchants interested in the Spanish trade took firmer ground when they declared that the trade in question was with a neutral, not with an enemy, and that it was no concern of ours what became of American wheat after it had once been landed in the Peninsula. Not only in New England, but in Virginia and Pennsylvania, was this style of argument advanced. Foremost among those who held these views was Thomas Jefferson, who declared that the only means whereby the deplorable conditions of the grain market might be relieved was by permitting trade with Spain. "I am favorable", he stated, "to the opinion which has been urged by others, sometime acted on, and now partly so by France and Great Britain, that commerce, under certain restrictions and licenses, may be indulged between enemies mutually advantageous to the individuals, and not to their injury as belligerents."⁴³

In Congress the matter had come up for discussion during the debate that had ensued over the Embargo Bill. No definite status, however, appears then to have been given to the Spanish trade. The war itself had theoretically stopped all trade with England and her dependencies, a principle which had been embodied in a measure approved July 6, 1812. This act expressly interdicted all trade with the enemy and its dependencies either under the disguise of neutral flags or by British licenses. Without a doubt this act covered the grain trade to the Peninsula, which was a dependency, if not in law or theory, at least in fact, for the time being. English troops were stationed in the Peninsula and to these English troops food supplies from America were shipped. In the absence, however, of an express provision covering the Spanish trade, American merchants willingly availed themselves of British licenses and shipped throughout the summer and fall of 1812 unprecedented quantities of produce. That this trade was illegal was beyond all question. It was, therefore, not unexpected that Madison should call the attention of Congress to the matter in the following words:

There being reason to believe that the act prohibiting the acceptance of British licenses is not a sufficient guard against the use of them . . .

⁴³ Jefferson to Madison, Apr. 17, 1812, *Writings* (ed. Ford), IX. 345.

further provisions on that subject are highly important. Nor is it less so that penal enactments should be provided for cases of corrupt and perfidious intercourse with the enemy, not amounting to treason nor yet embraced by any statutory provisions.⁴⁴

In compliance with this section of the message, Harper of New Hampshire immediately proposed in the House that the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures be instructed to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting entirely the exportation of flour and all wheat-stuffs. This proposal, however, was defeated by a vote of 76 to 26.⁴⁵ Two weeks later a bill prohibiting the use of all foreign licenses was presented by Newton of Virginia, from the committee, read twice, and committed to a committee of the whole, but it was not taken up till February 22, 1813, nor passed by the House till March 1, and then the Senate, as will be seen later, postponed it till the next session.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, however, friends of the administration and supporters of Harper's resolution were not so easily defeated. Early in December Newton introduced a similar resolution. "It was well known", he declared, "that there was not a day passed over our heads but American vessels were departing for Spanish and Portuguese ports, unrestricted as to the exportations of provisions and naval stores." It was not his purpose, however, to interdict a legitimate trade with a neutral but rather to prevent British agents from supplying English possessions with provisions laden in American vessels sailing under the Spanish or Portuguese flag. The agriculturists and farming interests, indignant at this attack which they declared would promote speculation, rallied their forces and defeated the measure by the narrow margin of but one vote.⁴⁷ Late in the afternoon of the following day, Harper attempted to renew his resolution; this time the vote stood 58 to 58, whereupon Speaker Clay promptly threw his vote in with the opposition, thereby defeating the motion.

After this defeat, Harper and Newton refrained from any further discussion of the matter for the remainder of the year. The proposition, however, came up time after time in the course of the session. During the debate relative to the Merchant's Bond Bill, Dr. Mitchell of New York drew the attention of the House to the trade with Spain.

We send freely abroad the products of our soil, although we feel a moral conviction that the greater part of the products will centre in Eng-

⁴⁴ Message of Nov. 4, 1812, Richardson, *Messages and Papers*, I. 519.

⁴⁵ *House Journal*, Nov. 6, 1812.

⁴⁶ *House Journal*, Nov. 23, 1812, Feb. 22, Mar. 1, 1813; *Senate Journal*, Mar. 3-

⁴⁷ *House Journal*, Dec. 1, 1812; *Annals of Congress*, 12 Cong., 2 sess., pp.

211, 214.

land . . . It is perfectly understood that Spain and Portugal cannot pay us in specie or produce for the breadstuffs and other articles of human sustenance which we send to Cadiz and Lisbon, and that these bills are paid for to a great extent in bills drawn upon London.

He called the House to witness that upon several occasions it had refused to inhibit the exportation of grain and had voted down all motions made to retain our produce at home in order to feed "our seamen, soldiers and civilians".⁴⁸ Several days later, Clay undertook to answer these statements. He insisted that the trade to the Peninsula was not censurable; on the contrary it possessed a most redeeming feature in that American produce was being paid for either in bills drawn on London, or in specie. Payment in specie was highly desirable not only for the revenue that it brought us, but also because the loss of this specie on the part of England directly injured her credit and undermined her resources. Hence the trade to the Peninsula should be viewed as a war measure in that it forced Great Britain to deplete her treasury in order to maintain an army on the Continent. It was Clay's modest estimate that at least twenty millions of dollars came annually into this country by reason of the trade with the Peninsula. A continuation of this policy would greatly endanger the strength of the paper system of the enemy and thus aid in bringing her to terms.⁴⁹

By way of answer, Newton pointed out on December 14, 1812, that Clay had opposed an embargo "principally for the reason that an embargo would prevent the importation into the United States of specie from Great Britain, through Spain and Portugal". Notwith-

⁴⁸ *Annals*, p. 239. As a matter of fact little grain was exported during the war from the United States to England directly (see above, page 24) or indirectly from Canada. What grain was smuggled into Canada appears to have been consumed there. English import figures for all grain imported from Canada during the years 1811 to 1814 are as follows:

1811	3,516 bushels	1813	7 bushels
1812	190,194 bushels	1814	21 bushels

Parl. Pap., 1825-1826, no. 227. Canada appears to have been itself in urgent need of food, as is revealed by the activities of the Victualling Office; see *Memoir of J. C. Herries* (London, 1880), I. 51. The shortage of the supply in Canada is also shown in a letter from a Mr. Robinson of Quebec, dated June 29, 1812, B.T. 5: 21, Sept. 22, 1812; see also letter from Admiral Sawyer, Halifax, Nov. 2, 1812, Admiralty Papers, 1: 502, f. 743.

⁴⁹ *Annals*, 12 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 299-300. It is interesting to note that Napoleon advocated, in part, the sale of grain to England for the same reason. See *Correspondance de Napoléon*, nos. 17974, 19391; see also Audrey Cunningham, *British Credit in the Last Napoleonic War* (Cambridge, 1910); J. H. Rose, in *Cambridge Modern History*, IX. 372; F. E. Melvin, *Napoleon's Navigation System* (New York, 1919), pp. 88-89.

standing the value of this specie, Newton insisted that an embargo would be a greater benefit as it would be the "strongest measure that Congress could adopt to give energy and effect to the war". The capital of this country, he declared, was employed to supply the enemy with American produce, not in American vessels but in British ships under the disguise of Swedish, Spanish, and Portuguese flags.⁵⁰

There can be little question that Harper and his friends had taken strong ground. It was well understood and admitted by both sides that the shipments to the Peninsula were destined solely for the use and sustenance of the British troops, forces which at any time might be employed against the liberties of the American people. All during the winter of 1812-1813, the discussion of the ethics of this trade continued with increasing strength. The effect of this, as well as of the severity of the winter, was to decrease the amount of the trade in general.⁵¹ The demand, however, for freights was still considerable. On December 23, Lawarson and Foule stated to Crowenshield: "Flour has been very fluctuating, varying from \$7.00 to \$11.00; Very large quantities have been shipped. Since the 1st of September we have shipped upwards of 30,000 barrels."⁵²

Into this lucrative trade was suddenly thrust the long arm of the British navy. Those who were fortunate enough to possess British licenses were permitted to proceed according to the tenor of their licenses; all others were brought into port to await trial and judgment.⁵³ Equally active was the American navy, which seems to have made a determined effort to check this illegal trade. The brig *Hiram* from Baltimore bound to Lisbon with 1500 pounds of flour was brought into Marblehead by the American frigate *Thorn*.⁵⁴

The effect of these numerous captures had been to lower the price of flour and to render trading with the Peninsula less profitable.⁵⁵ Metcalf, a prominent grain merchant of Virginia, deeply deplored this depression in trade. Nor did he take kindly to this intrusion by the American navy. Writing to his client Baxter he declared, ". . .

⁵⁰ *Annals*, 12 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 375-377; see above, p. 30, note 27.

⁵¹ This is evidenced by the following letter from Metcalf to Baxter, Nov. 24, 1812: "At this moment I cannot be reconciled to act in loading the ship *Monson* . . . A Bill is now before Congress making it penal for a ship to sail with a license . . . Therefore should a vessel sail and be captured by our cruisers, she would be involved if brought into a port in the United States." Metcalf's correspondence is to be found in the Letter Books of Josiah Faxon.

⁵² Lawarson and Foule to Crowenshield, Dec. 23, 1812.

⁵³ Lawarson and Foule to G. Snow, Jan. 28, 1813.

⁵⁴ *Boston Independent Chronicle*, Nov. 5. Dec. 14, 1812.

⁵⁵ Metcalf to Wm. Montgomery and Baxter, Nov. 14, 1812, Faxon Letter Books.

if our ships of war and privateers are allowed to bring in vessels that have licenses, then they may also bring them in on suspicion of their having them".⁵⁶ It is to be noted that Metcalf's entire reasoning rests upon the highly questionable supposition that the trade to the Peninsula was not trading with the enemy. Cautioned, however, by the fate of the brig *Hiram*, Metcalf determined to appeal to an authority higher than an American privateer before risking the *Monson* on a venture to Spain. Accordingly, he interviewed Monroe, then Secretary of State, in the hope of obtaining permission to load the *Monson* and sail unmolested. In a letter to Baxter, Metcalf stated that Monroe had given him to understand that the affair would be arranged "as soon as circumstances will permit".⁵⁷ Whether an arrangement was effected or not is uncertain. This much, however, is certain, that Metcalf stated in a letter to Baxter, January 11, 1813, that he had a license for the *Monson* to Cadiz, purchased for \$1133 and that the vessel would be despatched as soon as the weather permitted.⁵⁸

Metcalf, doubtless, was one among many who openly condemned the American government for its interference with a profitable trade. Jefferson, as we have already had occasion to note, criticized the administration for its conduct. In a letter of his dated January 12, 1813, we have this interesting disclosure of a peculiar mental trait:

You doubt whether we ought to permit the exportation of grain to our enemies; but Great Britain, with her own agricultural support, and those she can command by her access into every sea, cannot be starved by withholding our supplies. And if she is to be fed at all events, why may we not have the benefit of it as well as others? . . . And as to feeding her armies in the peninsular, she is fighting our battles there, as Bonaparte is on the Baltic . . . Besides, if we could, by starving the English armies, oblige them to withdraw from the peninsular, it would be to send them here; and I think we had better feed them there for pay, than feed and fight them here for nothing. A truth, too, not to be lost sight of is, that no country can pay war taxes if you suppress all their resources. To keep the war popular, we must keep open the markets. As long as good prices can be had, the people will support the war cheerfully.⁵⁹

Those opposing this view could not reconcile their ideas of patriotism to a standard so un-American or mercenary in nature. It was, therefore, not at all unexpected to have the matter come up once more for discussion in Congress. On February 24, 1813, the President

⁵⁶ Metcalf to Baxter, Nov. 14, 24, and 26, 1812.

⁵⁷ Metcalf to Baxter, Jan. 9, 1813.

⁵⁸ On Feb. 11, 1813, Metcalf informed Baxter that the *Monson* had sailed with a cargo valued at \$12,000.

⁵⁹ Jefferson to James Ronaldson, *Writings* (ed. Ford), IX. 372.

addressed Congress, calling its attention to the Order in Council of October 26, 1812, permitting a trade with the West Indies through the medium of licenses. In the course of this message, Madison strongly denounced this licensed trade and urged Congress to prohibit any trade under license whatsoever by citizens of the United States, and further to interdict exportation from America "in foreign bottoms, few of which are actually employed, whilst multiplying counterfeits of their flags and papers are covering and encouraging the navigation of the enemy".⁶⁰

It was doubtless in answer to this message that Calhoun presented a bill prohibiting the exportation in foreign bottoms of a list of enumerated commodities consisting largely of food supplies. After some discussion the bill was passed and sent to the Senate for consideration.⁶¹ In the meantime, the House took up, February 22, 1813, discussion of the Foreign License Bill that Newton had introduced in November. The purpose of this measure was to prohibit entirely the use of all foreign licenses by any American vessel. The usual arguments were advanced by both parties. It was clearly seen that the number of those opposing the measure was steadily decreasing. Attempts to postpone the proposition failed, and on the first of March the bill passed the House, 59 to 32. Immediately the measure was brought to the attention of the Senate, which, after referring it to the Committee of Foreign Affairs and having received it back with amendments, considered the proposition on the third of the month in conjunction with the Calhoun bill. By this time the Senate was contemplating adjournment and so postponed further consideration of these two bills until the next meeting of Congress.⁶²

In the meantime unusual activity was manifest among the grain merchants by reason of these measures. Lawarson and Foule stated that in view of the Order in Council and the proposed American embargo they were "pushing off all our vessels with licenses". The adjournment of Congress slackened considerably this haste on the part of that firm.⁶³ Public opinion, moreover, among the New England states was becoming adverse to the use of these licenses by reason of the scarcity and high price of flour in their markets.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Richardson, *Messages*, I. 523.

⁶¹ *House Journal*, Feb. 26, Mar. 2, 1813; *Annals*, 12 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 1127-1128, 1134-1164.

⁶² *House Journal*, Feb. 22 to Mar. 1; *Senate Journal*, Mar. 3; *Annals*, 12 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 112, 121, 1142, 1150.

⁶³ Lawarson and Foule to Rollins, Feb. 25, Mar. 2, 1813.

⁶⁴ Flour was selling for \$17.00 and \$18.00 a barrel, *Niles' Register*, IV. 184, 209.

Accordingly, after Congress had reassembled in May, 1813, a bill was introduced in the Senate forbidding the use of British licenses.⁶⁵ After much argument concerning which the *Annals* have very little to say, the measure was agreed to on July 15, by the comfortable vote of 22 to 12. The following day the measure came up for action in the House. It was not until the twenty-ninth, however, that the bill was finally passed, 78 to 33.⁶⁶

The acceptance of this measure by both Houses was a decided victory for the government. Its effects were far reaching, for it sealed every port in the United States against the egress of all American vessels possessing British licenses. It did not, however, prevent British ships disguised as neutrals from continuing this illegal trade. The License Bill, in short, did not check the exportation of food supplies to the enemy, a proposition which Madison discussed to some extent in his confidential message to Congress, July 20, 1813. In the thought of remedying this defect, Newton proposed that Congress prohibit the exportation of all provisions. Unfortunately Newton and Calhoun fell into an altercation as to what committee this matter should be referred to—the result of which was that the measure was “indefinitely postponed, in other words rejected”.⁶⁷

Further consideration of this act or any of a similar nature was rendered impossible by the adjournment of Congress. While doubtless disappointed over the reception accorded his motion, Newton as well as all friends of the administration had ample cause for satisfaction in the passage of the License Bill. This measure prohibited the sale, disposition, or use by a citizen of the United States or of its territory, of any license, pass, or paper granted by the British crown or its agents for the protection of any vessel or cargo, or admission of any vessel or cargo into any port. Anyone directly or indirectly concerned in the purchase, use, or disposition of any of these papers was upon conviction to forfeit a sum equal to the value of both the vessel and cargo, and pay in addition a fine of not more than \$5000 and not less than \$1000. Within five days after promulgation of the act in the nearest port, any vessel owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States found possessing a British license was to be forfeited. Vessels sailing with these papers were to be considered as British ships and as such were liable to capture and condemnation. Any vessel within the jurisdiction of the United States, sailing after the promulgation of this law, was held responsible for

⁶⁵ *Senate Journal*, June 28, 1813.

⁶⁶ *House Journal*, July 16, 29, 1813.

⁶⁷ *Annals*, 13 Cong., 1 sess., I. 487.

all violations of this measure. All ships sailing from Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa were rendered subject to the act after November 1, 1813, save of course upon being able to show that their passage had been delayed by stress of weather. The act, moreover, was not to be construed as ordering the suspension of any case involving the use of a British license.⁶⁸ In December of the same year Congress placed an embargo on all vessels in American ports, save neutrals, who might depart with necessary stores and whatsoever cargo they then possessed.⁶⁹

Without a doubt, the effect of this law would have been to close all trade to the Peninsula to all Americans or American vessels. As it was, the British government altered its policy to an extent that rendered it altogether problematic whether licenses already issued might not still be utilized by the present holders. Early in November, 1812, the Privy Council had decided that no more licenses would be granted for the Peninsular trade.⁷⁰ Nothing was said relative to those still unused, the intention evidently being that they should be honored. Shortly thereafter a modification occurred. Late in February the British government announced by an Order in Council the blockade of Chesapeake Bay.⁷¹

Information relative to this blockade reached America early in February, 1813. The actual presence of a blockading squadron under Admiral Warren was made known to American merchants by the news that certain vessels possessing British licenses had had their papers indorsed and had been ordered back into port.⁷² Metcalf at first refused to believe that the British government intended going back upon its given word. To his utter astonishment he witnessed the return of the *Monson*, which he had only recently been able to despatch after considerable delay and great cost. Investigation revealed that the *Monson* had been stopped by one of Admiral Warren's ships, its license indorsed, and the *Monson* itself ordered back into

⁶⁸ *U. S. Statutes*, 13 Cong., 1 sess., c. 57. For cases arising from this act see 8 Cranch: the *Julia Luce*, the *Aurora Pike*, and the *Hiram Parker*.

⁶⁹ *U. S. Statutes*, 13 Cong., 2 sess., c. 1.

⁷⁰ Privy Council Unbound Papers, Council Minute, Nov. 14, 1812.

⁷¹ Order in Council, Dec. 26, 1812. In point of fact the British Admiralty had instructed Warren to blockade Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, Nov. 27, 1812. In reply Warren stated, Feb. 21, 1813, that the blockade had already been put into force; see Admiralty Papers, 1: 503, Warren to Croker, Feb. 21, 1813. By Order in Council, Mar. 30, 1813, this blockade was extended to New York, Charleston, Port Royal, and the Mississippi River. Warren by proclamation, Nov. 16, 1813, extended it to everything south of Narragansett Bay; see *Niles' Register*, V. 264.

⁷² Metcalf to Baxter, Feb. 11, 13, 22, 1813; Lawarson and Foulé to Jackson, Feb. 11, 1813.

port. Thoroughly indignant, Metcalf declared the entire proceeding to be a "breach of faith on the part of the [British] Government".⁷³

Breach or no breach, the British government had blockaded Chesapeake Bay and had stationed Warren there to see to it that the blockade was enforced. And yet, it is believed, this was not a breach of faith. It had been the custom for some time past during the war with France to declare certain ports blockaded, entrance or exit being denied to all, even to those who possessed licenses to trade with the enemy. Only under particular circumstances might a vessel enter a port actually blockaded and then only upon possession of a license in which the name of the blockaded port had been entered by the crown's agents.⁷⁴ Metcalf, indeed, ought to have congratulated himself upon having the *Monson* at his dock rather than tied up at Halifax waiting action of the prize court, a procedure perfectly in keeping with British policy. Others besides Metcalf suffered in the same manner. Attempts to evade the British squadron usually proved a failure.⁷⁵ Vessels with over 40,000 barrels of flour were held in port at Alexandria by reason of the blockade.⁷⁶ Flour steadily fell in price until by April 24 it had come down to \$6.00 a barrel. At the same time came the dismal announcement from Warren "that nothing is allowed to go out. Licenses are worth nothing . . . will not be for Americans during the war. Licenses can only be made use of by neutrals and from Eastern Ports".⁷⁷

⁷³ Metcalf to Baxter, Feb. 22, 1813.

⁷⁴ An examination of hundreds of licenses in the Public Record Office and Privy Council Office, as well as of certain Orders in Council, discloses this interesting feature of the license system.

⁷⁵ Lawarson and Foule to Ligowney, Mar. 11, 1813. See *London Gazette*. Mar. 23 and Sept. 7, 1813, for a list of ships captured by Warren from Sept. 16, 1812, to July 22, 1813.

⁷⁶ Lawarson and Foule to Coolidge, Mar. 13, 1813.

⁷⁷ Metcalf to Baxter, Apr. 10, 1813. Eastern ports were favored so as to promote smuggling into Canada and to develop disaffection in the New England district. Considerable light is thrown upon this policy by a letter from Barclay to the Foreign Office, Oct. 19, 1812, which was forwarded to the Board of Trade, Nov. 7, 1812, B.T. 1: 72. Barclay urged that vessels of the United States under 150 tons should be permitted to carry needed supplies to the West Indies. This would give the Eastern states a limited commerce, and afford employment for the seamen of this section, thus keeping them out of the American navy. He also suggested that no ships be allowed to depart from any port west of the western extremity of Connecticut; that the Mississippi be carefully watched, as it was the only outlet for the produce of the Western country; and that a blockade should be declared of all ports from the eastern half of Long Island to Amelia Island. By an Order in Council, Oct. 26, 1812, the governors of the West Indies were given permission to license the importation of grain and provisions from America, provided these licenses were issued to United States citizens of the Eastern ports; B.T. 1: 70, Bathurst to the Board of Trade. Nov. 11, 1812.

From that time until the close of the war, little grain appears to have been shipped from Southern ports. Occasionally a neutral vessel, or an American turned neutral, was able to slip by the British fleet; but with these few exceptions all trade was interdicted.⁷⁸ Those few who managed to clear the bay in safety, Metcalf believed to have obtained special privileges. "Vessels have gone out belonging to a house in New York. How they have gone, I can not learn. I have had authority for stating that the vessels belonging to this house had through the intercession of the Barings of London obtained permission to sail."⁷⁹ For some unknown reason, Baxter believed that the *Monson*, possessing a British license, would pass the English fleet in safety. Possibly he was determined to take a chance after having plunged so deeply into the venture. Metcalf, accordingly, was instructed to despatch the *Monson* as soon as possible. Upon the very day of the receipt of this letter, the *Monson* weighed anchor and put out to sea. By dusk the vessel was back once more, safely tied to the dock, where it stayed for the remainder of the war. The occasion for its return this time does not appear to have been the British blockading squadron. Actually, the *Monson* never got so far out to sea, having been stopped before it left the harbor proper by the customs official of the United States, who informed the captain of the *Monson* that the Secretary of the Navy had recently issued an order forbidding the departure of all vessels.⁸⁰

It was, therefore, as a result of both the American License Bill and the change in the British policy that the profitable grain trade to the Peninsula was abolished. The cause for this change on the part of the British government is not difficult to explain. The sudden opening of the North Baltic ports late in 1812 and early in 1813, by reason of the collapse of the Continental System, released for British consumption vast stores of grain and flour. In the future, therefore, British armies in the Peninsula, or elsewhere for that matter, would not be dependent upon American grain as they had been during the immediate past. The Peninsula, moreover, was amply stocked with grain and flour by this time. Over 160,000 barrels of flour were

⁷⁸ Metcalf to Baxter, May 12, 1813; Lawarson and Foule to Meyers, May 1, 1813; *Niles' Register*, IV. 245. See Admiralty Papers, 2: 932, letter to Warren, Aug. 13, 1813, directing him to institute a strict blockade.

⁷⁹ Metcalf to Baxter, June 26, 1813.

⁸⁰ Metcalf to Baxter, July 31, 1813. A copy of this letter, together with the comment "What a pity the *Monson* was not permitted to violate 'his majestys strict blockade of the Chesapeake'", appeared in *Niles' Register*, IV. 386-387; see also IV. 402 for an indorsement of the letter by Capt. Norris, U. S. N.

reported as being unsold in Cadiz.⁸¹ Hence the license trade, so far as Americans were concerned, was practically abolished before the passage of the License Bill. That it had not been prevented before, and at a time when the British government would have felt the want of American wheat and flour, was due largely to the determined effort of the agriculturists in America to sell their produce to the English—war or no war.

W. FREEMAN GALPIN.

⁸¹ *Niles' Register*, IV. 200, 280; see also *Providence Gazette*, May 1, 29, and June 29, 1813. During the first half of 1813, 615 vessels entered Lisbon, only 165 being American, a decided decrease from the previous year. Of these 61 came from New York, 25 from Charleston, 18 from Philadelphia, and the others from various ports. On the other hand there was an increase in the number of foreign vessels that entered with grain from America: 24 Portuguese, 2 Spanish, and 1 Swedish; B.T. 1: 79, letter from Foreign Office, July 26, 1813, enclosing Stuart's report for the first half of 1813.

SEWARD'S FAR EASTERN POLICY

IN the nineteenth century only three secretaries of state—Webster, Seward, and Hay—made positive contributions to American policy in the Far East. Where other administrations took up the question it was in an ineffective or negative way. Webster's contribution was, of the three, the least creative, for in his instructions to Cushing for the treaty with China¹ and to Commodore John H. Aulick for a treaty with Japan² he did little more than adopt as official the policies of the American traders in their dealings with the Chinese. Webster caught their spirit and put it into elevated language, but he added little or nothing to it. Seward's contribution was more important, for he reversed not only the policy of Webster but all traditional American policy in the East. Indeed one is warranted in placing the bulk if not the quality of Seward's contribution to the body of Far Eastern policy above that of Hay, for in 1899 when Hay turned to this difficult problem he must have been made aware that all its paths had been traversed in the sixties either by Seward or by his able representative at Peking, Anson Burlingame. Hay added nothing in principle; rather, he returned to policies from which his predecessors in the seventies and eighties had departed. Absolutely no new principles have been added to American Far Eastern policy since 1869. The "open-door" policy is as old as the most-favored-nation clause in the Cushing Treaty with China (1844). The policy of protecting China by agreement among the powers is not greatly different from the policy of the Burlingame Mission to the Western nations (1867-1870). The co-operative policy as it appeared in China in 1900, during the World War, and again in the treaties of 1922, reached its maximum development under Seward in 1866. Co-operation with other Western powers in the East has never been carried so far since that time.

The discussion of American policy in the Far East is sometimes misleading when it seizes upon the open-door policy as primary, for while that is the substance of American purpose, the play of policy is not around this doctrine, from which the American government has never receded, but around the method by which it may be made effective, *i.e.*, whether by isolated or by co-operative action. It is in the meeting of this choice between two widely divergent methods of

¹ *Sen. Doc.* 138, 28 Cong., 2 sess.

² *Sen. Ex. Doc.* 59, 32 Cong., 1 sess., p. 80.

realizing American purposes that a study of Seward's administration is most rewarding.

Seward did not inaugurate the co-operative policy in Eastern Asia. As early as April 22, 1851, Dr. Peter Parker, acting as chargé d'affaires at Canton, urged upon Webster, then secretary of state, a co-operative policy which would have for its object to prevent Great Britain from undertaking belligerent measures against China.³ Parker was at that time expecting that Great Britain would proceed to the partition of the empire. Two years later Parker's advice was accepted by Marcy and somewhat timidly applied. After the middle of 1853 the standing instruction to the American representatives in China was to co-operate with the powers, namely, with England, France, and Russia, in all peaceful measures. This policy of co-operation, however, always broke down in application because the American government could not reach an agreement, particularly with Great Britain, as to either the methods or the purposes of co-operation. But by the time Seward had entered the Department of State there had come a change. Great Britain and France might be presumed to have obtained in China by the war of 1857-1860 all that could reasonably be desired. The treaty powers found that for the time being their interests were identical. The influence of Palmerston was rapidly receding in the British Foreign Office, and into the Department of State came Seward, who, while in his best moments a statesman, was always a politician and temperamentally a co-operator. A co-operative policy admirably served the purpose of Seward in 1861, for every measure was desirable which gathered any or all of the trans-Atlantic powers into a concert with, rather than against, the United States at the opening of the Civil War. The difference between Seward and his predecessors, Marcy and Cass, in the matter of co-operation was that Seward was bold, was willing to play politics on an international scale, was supported by a war spirit within the nation, and was quite willing to pay the price of co-operation. A more fundamental difference was that Seward, more than any of his predecessors, valued the potential commercial opportunities of the United States in Eastern Asia.

Seward entered the Department of State with large and positive convictions on the nature and the future of American relations with Asia. This is evident from his previous record in the Senate. He was a most enthusiastic supporter of every movement to establish

³ China Despatches, vol. 6 (Department of State): "To prevent any one of the powers adopting *coercive* measures, it is proposed that joint *peaceful* steps be taken by all."

American foreign trade. "The nation", he said, "must command the empire of the seas, which alone is real empire." This empire, it seemed to him, must include the Pacific as well as the Atlantic. Indeed he foresaw the day when the Atlantic interests of the United States would relatively sink in importance, "while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast regions beyond" would become the "chief theatre in the events of the world's great hereafter". This famous assertion, made in 1852 while the Perry Expedition was in preparation, was no isolated flight of oratory; Seward had a very definite idea as to the function of the American people in the commerce of the Pacific Ocean. Foreign trade, he thought, was to replace military conquest and to become the vehicle for the commerce of ideas. The great American contribution to the world, it seemed to him, was political and social theory. Just as the Atlantic states through their commercial, social, and political sympathies were steadily renovating the governments and social constitutions of Europe and Africa, so "the Pacific states must necessarily perform the same sublime and beneficent functions in Asia". Seward appears to have expected that Asia, thus enriched from America, would repay the gift in gratitude. While Perry was in the East, Seward said: "Certainly no one expects the nations of Asia to be awakened by any other influence than our own from the lethargy into which they sunk nearly three thousand years ago. If they could be roused and invigorated now, would they spare their European oppressors and spite their American benefactors?"

So convinced was Seward of the value of the Pacific Coast to the United States that he would, notwithstanding his convictions on the subject of slavery, vote to receive California as a state even though it were to become slave territory. He believed in the Japan Expedition, expressing the conviction that the proper question for the Senate to ask was not why it had been sent, but why it had not been sent before. He urged the completion of the surveys of the Pacific Ocean; he favored the encouragement of Chinese immigration to California; and among the projects to which he lent persistent and energetic leadership, were the construction of the trans-continental railroad and the inauguration of a line of mail steamers from San Francisco, by way of the Sandwich Islands, to Japan and China. Lincoln could not have chosen from among the conspicuous leaders of the day a secretary of state who would have brought to the Far Eastern question more previous thought and conviction.*

* *Works of William H. Seward* (ed. Baker), I. 51 ff., 58, 236 ff., 249-250, 356; IV. 125, 24, 25.

That there would some day come a clash between American and European interests in Asia, Seward seems also to have been aware. To Cassius M. Clay, the newly appointed American minister to Russia, Seward wrote in 1861: "Russia and the United States may remain good friends until, each having made the circuit of half the globe in opposite directions, they shall meet and greet each other in regions where civilization first began and where, after so many ages, it has become now lethargic and helpless."⁵

"People not in sympathy with his prophecies", remarks Seward's biographer, "had maintained that he was in favor of adding at least a part of China to the national domain."⁶ There can be no doubt that Seward belonged more to the Perry than to the Cushing and Webster school of Far Eastern policy, but there is no evidence that in the management of American affairs in Asia he had any object beyond securing for the United States such a position that, come what might, his government would be able to defend its citizens and uphold their interests. In this regard his policy was similar to that of McKinley a generation later, who held the Philippines when the partition of China was being threatened.

Seward, as we have remarked, was willing to pay the price of co-operation. In China there was no price to pay. Burlingame dominated the co-operative policy and made it serve the characteristically American purpose of sustaining and assisting the imperial government. But in Japan the co-operative policy, forged by the Americans, became the weapon in the hands of Sir Rutherford Alcock and Sir Harry Parkes for the accomplishment of purposes which departed widely from traditional American policy. "The President does not fail to observe", wrote Seward to Robert H. Pruyn, American minister in Yedo in 1863, "that some of the agents of some of the other treaty powers pursue, in their intercourse with the Japanese, a course more energetic, if not more vigorous, than that which you have followed under the instructions of this department."⁷ Nevertheless Seward approved of co-operation. It was important for domestic reasons when the Civil War was at its height, and it was also important to American interests in the East that in whatever action was taken the Americans be represented. Only by co-operation, Seward appears to have argued, could American interests be protected, and only in that way could the action of such men as Alcock and Parkes in Japan, and, later, Bellonet in Peking, be

⁵ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1861, p. 293; also *Works of Seward*, V. 246.

⁶ Frederic Bancroft, *Life of William H. Seward*, II. 472.

⁷ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1863, II. 1066.

moderated and kept in line with the preservation of American interests.

Seward's co-operative policy outside of China led him into several very un-American courses of action. In May, 1861, upon receipt of information from Yedo which led him to believe that the Japanese were embarked upon a policy of ignoring the treaties of 1858 and perhaps expelling the foreigners from their empire, Seward proposed the well-known joint naval expedition against Japan. This proposal called for the presentation of a joint note at Yedo accompanied by the assembling of a combined fleet of all the treaty powers in Japanese waters. The note was to be in the form of an ultimatum. If the answer were unfavorable or evasive, Seward proposed that the diplomatic representatives be withdrawn and that "such hostilities be commenced and prosecuted as the naval commanders may deem most likely to bring the Japanese to a sense of their obligations". To this proposal there were attached two qualifications: (1) that the United States would make a special demand for satisfaction for the murder of Heusken, who had been the interpreter at the American legation; and (2) that the convention between the powers was not to be considered obligatory on the United States until the sanction of Congress had been obtained to the beginning of hostilities.⁸ Townsend Harris, American minister in Japan at the time, was wholly opposed to the plan and felt that Seward had failed to grasp the situation in Japan. Happily it came to nothing. If it stood alone among Seward's proposals for Japan we might dismiss it as an aberration like the "Thoughts" presented to Lincoln only a few weeks before, or as a purely diplomatic move to divert the threatened intervention of European powers in the Civil War; but it did not stand alone. Seward returned not once but repeatedly to a similar policy in Japan and was prepared to extend it even to Korea.

The attack of the U. S. S. *Wyoming* at the Straits of Shimonoseki, the joint attack at the same place of the British, French, Dutch, and American forces the following year, and the joint convention of 1866, which was practically dictated from the gun-deck of a British

⁸ Notes to the Russian Legation, vol. 6 (Department of State), May 20, 1861, Seward to Stoeckl: "It is understood that the Constitution of the United States requires the sanction of Congress to the commencement of hostilities against a foreign power, and this convention is not to be considered obligatory on the Government until that sanction shall have been obtained." This is from Seward's draft of the proposed convention to be signed by the ministers of France, England, Russia, Prussia, and the United States. The details of the proposed demonstration, so far as they were published, are in *Foreign Relations*, 1862, pp. 547, 814-816.

flag-ship, all of them approved by Seward, were un-American when judged by the entire American record in Asia.⁹

The convention of 1866 is notable.¹⁰ It contains in the preamble the statement that the representatives of the signatory Western powers had "received from their respective governments identical instructions for the modification of the tariff of import and export duties contained in the trade regulations annexed to the treaties" of 1858 which provided for a revision five years after the opening of Kana-gawa, *i.e.*, on July 4, 1864. To this convention, which not only reduced the tariff to specific duties estimated on an *ad valorem* basis of five per cent., similar to that from which China is not yet free, but also made revision impossible without the consent of all the treaty powers, A. L. C. Portman, chargé d'affaires for the United States, put his name upon the advice of Sir Harry Parkes. It was not signed under any such specific instructions as the preamble states. Indeed, a search of the entire diplomatic correspondence for the period discovers nothing more than the most general instructions bearing upon the subject. Perhaps the nearest to specific, or identical, instructions was a copy of a despatch shown to Portman by Parkes, in which Seward had written to Sir Frederick Bruce (August 15, 1865) that while the Senate had not yet ratified the convention of 1864 with reference to the Shimonoseki indemnity he was unable to approve Lord Russell's plans for the reduction of the duties, yet "anticipating the ratification, this government is disposed to concur provisionally and to co-operate in the plans proposed by Her Majesty's Government".¹¹

It is not apparent from the record that Portman, much less Seward, had any clear notion of what Sir Harry Parkes was accom-

⁹ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1863, III. 1060; 1864, III. 553, 579, 581, 584; Moore, *Digest*, V. 749-751.

¹⁰ See Payson J. Treat, *Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan*, pp. 393-406, for an excellent summary of the conditions under which the convention was secured.

¹¹ Notes to Great Britain, vol. 13, Aug. 15, 1865, Seward to Bruce. This was in reply to a memorandum from Bruce, British Legation, vol. 79, July 29, 1865, Bruce to Seward, in which a letter of Lord Russell's to Bruce was transmitted to Seward. It proposed that the representatives of the treaty powers in Japan be instructed to co-operate in securing from the Tycoon's government a reduction of duties to five per cent. and "in no case to exceed ten per cent." in return for a commutation of two-thirds of the \$3,000,000 Shimonoseki indemnity. Nothing was said in this proposal about the character of the convention to be secured, or about the naval demonstration by which it was actually accomplished. Portman stated (Japan Desp., vol. 6, Nov. 18, 1865) that he had seen a copy of Seward's letter to Bruce. Apparently no copy of it had been sent to Portman.

plishing in the convention of 1866. Nevertheless Seward, true to his policy, approved the compact and sent it to the Senate, which also approved. This was the document which kept Japan in bondage to British mercantile interests for nearly half a century.¹²

Seward was willing to pay the price of co-operation even in a "gun-boat policy" because he was convinced that the American people had before them the possibility of making, in time, an easy commercial conquest of Asia, and meanwhile he felt himself to be preparing the way. Where co-operative rather than isolated action would advance his purpose he did not shrink from co-operation under the only conditions which for the moment seemed possible. This co-operation in a belligerent policy continued after all reasons for it arising out of the Civil War had disappeared. A hitherto unknown item in his policy with reference to Korea throws much light not only on the extent of his vision but also on the methods of his statecraft.

On January 22, 1867, there was received at the Department of State a despatch from S. Wells Williams, chargé d'affaires at Peking during the absence on leave in the United States of Anson Burlingame, conveying the following information: some French missionaries had been put to death in Korea; Admiral Roze with some French naval vessels had gone to Korea to make an investigation; he had returned with the information that in August (1866) an American trading schooner, the *General Sherman*, with the owner on board, loaded with cotton goods, glass, tin plates, etc., for an exploratory trading expedition, had been caught in the Ping Yang-so River and had been burned, and the Americans had been put to death.¹³

A month later (February 26, 1867) a second despatch on the subject, signed by Burlingame, who meanwhile had returned to Peking, contained the more startling intelligence that the French chargé, M. de Bellonet, upon receipt of the news of the murder of the missionaries, had formally notified the astonished Prince Kung, practically the prime minister of China, that France proposed to "march to the conquest of Korea" and that a French protectorate would be established over the peninsula.¹⁴

¹² For the way in which the Americans generally came to regard the convention of 1866, see two articles by E. H. House, "The Thralldom of Japan", and "The Martyrdom of an Empire", particularly the former, *Atlantic Monthly*, vols. LX. (1887) and XLVII. (1881). House was wholly incorrect in many of his statements as to the existing relations between the United States and Japan when he wrote, but the articles are an accurate reflection of the opinion of Americans in regard to the convention.

¹³ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1867, I. 414-415. The original despatch is stamped: "Received Jan. 22, 1867".

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 419 ff., Dec. 12, 1866, Burlingame to Seward.

The facts of the Franco-Korean situation were as follows:

In March, 1866, nine French missionaries had been put to death by order of the Regent, the famous Tai-wan-kun, in the course of a vigorous anti-foreign crusade which had been stimulated by the recent aggressions of the foreigners in China and Japan, and more especially, perhaps, by the menace of Russia on the northern border of the peninsula.¹⁵ News of the massacre reached Chefoo July 7, 1866. Six days later the French chargé at Peking, M. de Bellonet, telegraphed the bare facts to Paris and stated that Admiral Roze was proceeding to Korea, where no resistance from the Koreans was expected. On the same day Bellonet took it upon himself to address to Prince Kung the extraordinary note referred to above.

The government of his Majesty, [wrote Bellonet,] can not permit so bloody an outrage to go unpunished. The same day on which the King of Korea laid his hands upon my unhappy countrymen, was the last of his reign; he himself proclaimed its end, which I in my turn solemnly declare today. In a few days our military forces are to march to the conquest of Korea, and the Emperor, my august sovereign, alone, has now the right and the power to dispose, according to his good pleasure, of the country and the vacant throne.¹⁶

A severe reproof was addressed to Bellonet by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 10, 1866, but of course this did not arrive at Peking until early in the following year.

The interest of France in Korea was not news to the Department of State. As far back as December 12, 1856, Dr. Peter Parker, American commissioner to China, presumably after conference with the French as well as with the British representatives, had recommended that the three nations join in coercive measures against China and proposed that the French flag "be hoisted in Korea, the English again at Chusan, and the United States in Formosa, and there to remain until satisfaction for the past and a right understanding for

¹⁵ Henri Cordier, *Relations de la Chine avec les Puissances Occidentales* (Paris, 1901), I. 267 ff.; W. E. Griffis, *Corea, the Hermit Nation* (New York, 1907, eighth ed.), pp. 373, 482-483; G. H. Jones, *Korean Repository*, July, 1898.

¹⁶ Cordier (I. 268) reproduces this despatch with an addition stating that "the prince to whom will be confided the destinies of Korea under the protectorate of his Majesty, the Emperor, must become a Christian." The text of the ensuing correspondence between Bellonet and Prince Kung did not become known to the other foreign representatives in Peking until Nov. 20, when, presumably upon the advice of Anson Burlingame, whom Prince Kung consulted in the matter, copies of it were sent to all the legations. "I submit it," wrote Burlingame to Seward, Dec. 12, 1866, "without one word of comment." *Dipl. Corr.*, 1867, I. 419 ff.

the future are granted". A similar proposition was presented to President Pierce by the French minister a few weeks later.¹⁷

After the treaties between the foreign powers and China and Japan in 1858, the ultimate objects of Great Britain and France (the American government seems never to have been disturbed about Russian ambitions) were a matter of grave concern to American representatives in Yedo and Peking. There was a good deal of talk at the time of the occupation of Tsushima by Russia (1861) to the effect that the European powers were planning a partition of Japan.¹⁸

The co-operative policy in China under Burlingame had its birth in the efforts of the American minister to bring the foreign powers, particularly France, into line with a policy which would respect the sovereignty of the empire over the various foreign settlements at the open ports.¹⁹ Fresh in Seward's mind when he read of the French expedition to Korea were his recent interviews with Anson Burlingame, whom only a few months before he had persuaded to return to Peking where his services could so ill be spared. Seward jumped to the conclusion that the expected partition of Asia had already begun.

The end of the episode in the Far East must be summarized briefly. The second expedition of Admiral Roze in November, although accomplishing the destruction of the Korean city of Kwang-hoa, below Seoul, was inconclusive, and without material success. The French, although they had withdrawn several hundred troops from the French garrison at Yokohama for the expedition, thus creating a sore spot in Korean-Japanese relations,²⁰ were not prepared for the conquest of the peninsula, which was the only method by which satisfaction and a treaty could have been achieved. The expedition was generally regarded in China as having been a failure, and the reports spread to Paris, where they were seized upon by the opposition in the Corps Législatif to embarrass the government; What was the government going to do to restore the loss of French prestige in Mexico and Korea? Orders are believed to have been issued for

¹⁷ *Sen. Ex. Doc.* 22, 35 Cong., 2 sess., II. 1083; *China Instr.*, vol. I., Feb. 27, 1857, Marcy to Parker.

¹⁸ "For the last eighteen months many officials, English and French, civilians and naval men, have frequently declared that a war with Japan was inevitable, and that it could only end in the partition of the country. It is said that the Russian commander justified his action by referring to those declarations, adding that he remains at Tsushima solely for the purpose of preventing its falling into the power of the English and the French." Harris to Seward, Oct. 7, 1861, *Japan Desp.*, vol. 13.

¹⁹ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1862, p. 833; 1863, pp. 851, 856; 1864, pp. 419, 426.

²⁰ Nagao Ariga, p. 148, in *Stead, Japan by the Japanese* (London, 1904).

the suspension of Admiral Roze and for the recall of Bellonet for their wholly unauthorized activities, but the new attacks upon the government caused a change of policy. "It was suddenly discovered that the first reports about the defeat of the Korean Expedition were erroneous; that the command of Admiral Roze, instead of suffering defeat, had severely chastized the Koreans; that the outrages inflicted by that people upon the missionaries had been effectually and amply redressed; and that the dignity and honor of the government had been fully vindicated."²¹ It then became necessary to reinstate Admiral Roze, and Bellonet, saved from disgrace, was promoted to Stockholm.²²

On March 2, 1867, four days after the receipt of the Burlingame despatch, Seward, having before him only the information supplied from Peking and knowing nothing of the fact that Bellonet's and Roze's actions had been repudiated by their government, had a conference with M. Berthemy, the French minister in Washington, ostensibly upon another subject.²³ In the course of the conversation, rather abruptly, so Berthemy thought, Seward proposed that the United States and France unite in a joint action to obtain from Korea satisfaction for the murders of the Frenchmen and the Americans. The text of Berthemy's despatch to Paris in which the Seward proposal is discussed follows:²⁴

WASHINGTON, LE 3 MARS 1867.

Monsieur le Marquis,²⁵

Votre Excellence a sans doute appris, par la correspondance de la Légation de l'Empereur à Pékin, qu'un bâtiment de commerce des États-Unis, le *Général Sherman*, a été incendié sur la côte de Corée et son équipage cruellement mis à mort. Me parlant hier de ce fait, à l'occasion de récentes dépêches qu'il avait reçues de Chine, et sans qu'aucune ouverture de ma part l'eût amené dans cette voie, M. Seward

²¹ F. F. Low to Hamilton Fish, Feb. 1, 1873, China Desp., vol. 33. This information was supplied to Mr. Low in Peking by M. de Geofroy, then French minister to China, who in 1867 had been attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris; see *post*.

²² Cordier (I. 269-271) bears out the statement that there were two publications of the news in the *Moniteur* (Dec. 27, 1866, and Jan. 7, 1867), and that Bellonet, whom he describes as "d'un caractère trop vif", was promoted.

²³ Berthemy had been appointed Oct. 28, 1866. He arrived early in January, 1867. He had previously served as the French representative in Peking, to which post he was appointed Oct. 14, 1862. Cordier, I. 69, note; F. W. Williams, *Anson Burlingame*, p. 36.

²⁴ This document, the only known record of the plan, was kindly supplied from the archives of the French embassy by His Excellency the French Ambassador at Washington, Mr. Jusserand, through the good offices of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson.

²⁵ Marquis de Moustier, French minister of foreign affairs September, 1866-December, 1868.

m'a demandé si le Gouvernement de l'Empereur, désirant obtenir une satisfaction plus complète du meurtre juridique des missionnaires français, ne serait pas disposé à agir de concert avec celui des États-Unis pour décider la Corée à accepter un traité conforme à ceux qui ont été conclus avec la Chine et le Japon.

J'ai répondu au Secrétaire d'État, qu'en principe la France était certainement prête à appuyer toute action collective des Puissances occidentales qui tendrait à ouvrir au commerce maritime un marché encore fermé et qui aurait, en outre, pour résultat d'assurer l'intégrité du royaume de Corée, fort compromise, à mon avis, par l'ambition d'un puissant voisin; mais que j'ignorais si l'on ne considérerait pas à Paris comme un châtiment suffisant de l'assassinat de nos missionnaires, la leçon infligée l'automne dernier à ce pays.

Développant alors sa pensée, M. Seward m'a dit qu'il avait conçu ce projet bien moins en raison de l'importance des intérêts engagés en Corée que pour affirmer publiquement la bonne harmonie qui existe entre les États-Unis et la France. "On saura ainsi", a-t-il ajouté, "que tout sujet de mésintelligence a disparu; mais pour que la preuve soit complète il convient que les deux pays ne recherchent dans cette circonstance aucune assistance étrangère et que, s'il y a lieu de recourir à la force des armes, aucun autre drapeau ne flotte à côté des leurs. Nous avons seuls des griefs, cela suffit pour expliquer que nous agissions seuls. Je vous prie de demander par voie télégraphique l'autorisation de vous entendre à ce sujet avec moi, car il n'y a pas de temps à perdre si l'on veut profiter de la saison favorable aux opérations."

Les instructions du Département me prescrivant de saisir toutes les occasions qui pourront s'offrir d'établir une entente avec le Gouvernement des États-Unis, il m'était impossible de décliner la transmission de la proposition qui m'était faite. J'ai répondu, toutefois, que je jugeais nécessaire d'accompagner cette proposition d'explications trop développées pour comporter l'emploi du télégraphe, mais que je demanderais à Votre Excellence de vouloir bien faire usage de ce moyen pour y répondre.

Le projet du Secrétaire d'État présente, Monsieur le Marquis, d'incontestables avantages. Sa mise à exécution aurait pour résultat: aux États-Unis de transformer de la manière la plus complète les dispositions de l'opinion publique à notre égard et, par suite, celles du Gouvernement, quel que soit le parti qui arrive au pouvoir; en Chine, de consolider notre influence à laquelle les résultats incomplets obtenus par l'amiral Roze n'auront pas manqué de porter atteinte; en Corée, enfin, d'ouvrir ce pays au commerce et de mettre un terme à son isolement, qui, si l'on n'y arrive, aura infailliblement pour conséquence son absorption par la Russie qui le convoite afin de donner à la Sibérie orientale les débouchés maritimes que la rigueur du climat refuse presque constamment à cette dernière dans ses limites actuelles.

Toutefois, il est peut-être une ombre à ce tableau. Votre Excellence aura remarqué le soin avec lequel le Secrétaire d'État insiste sur la nécessité pour la France et les États-Unis *d'agir seuls*, et l'on ne saurait nier qu'au point de vue où se place M. Seward, ce fait ne doive produire sur l'opinion, en Amérique, comme en Europe, une impression plus grande que si les deux Gouvernements s'adjoignaient une tierce Puissance. Cependant, les difficultés éventuelles que la question du Canada peut susciter au Cabinet de Washington sont-elles complètement étrangères au vœu

émis par le Secrétaire d'État de voir la France et les États-Unis s'engager dans une entreprise dont l'Angleterre serait écartée? Il vous appartient, Monsieur le Marquis, d'apprécier la valeur de cette indication, dont je ne voudrais pas d'ailleurs exagérer l'importance, car, ainsi que je l'ai déjà écrit, je ne pense pas que la réunion des Possessions britanniques donne lieu à un conflit dans les circonstances actuelles.

Quant aux moyens d'atteindre le but indiqué, c'est à dire une indemnité pécuniaire pour les familles des victimes et la conclusion d'un traité, ils consisteraient dans une pression exercée simultanément par les deux Légations à Pékin, où j'ai des motifs de compter sur le crédit personnel du Ministre des États-Unis; puis, en cas d'insuccès, dans l'emploi de moyens coercitifs contre le Gouvernement coréen. Dans le cas où Votre Excellence jugerait à propos de me donner par voie télégraphique, comme le désire le Secrétaire d'État, l'autorisation nécessaire, il me serait facile de régler ces divers points à l'aide d'un échange, soit de déclarations, soit de simples notes, et sans instructions ultérieures. Lorsque cette autorisation me parviendra, il est, du reste, vraisemblable que je serai en mesure de juger si la situation politique des États-Unis permet d'en faire usage, ou bien si, prévoyant la chute prochaine du président Johnson et sa propre retraite, M. Seward n'a eu d'autre objet en vue, lorsqu'il m'a fait la proposition dont j'ai l'honneur d'entretenir Votre Excellence, que d'effacer, en ce qui le concerne personnellement, le souvenir de son attitude à notre égard pendant la durée de l'expédition du Mexique.

Veuillez, etc.

BERTHEMY.

For one other reason the proposal might have aroused Berthemy's speculations. Not only was Seward's proposition merely verbal²⁶ but also, while there was a precedent for such proposed action in the proposal made by Seward in May, 1861, for a joint naval demonstration against Japan, the present proposition was unaccompanied by any reservation as to the consent necessary from Congress, such as had characterized the earlier one. Did Seward in the present instance have it in mind to ignore Congress, to depend entirely upon the existing naval forces in the Far East, and then to present Congress with a treaty with Korea, as he was already planning to do in the case of the Alaska purchase?²⁷

For reasons which have already been explained Seward's proposal when it arrived in Paris was inopportune and was gracefully declined in the following instruction. This was drafted by M. de Geofroy, at that time *sous-directeur* for the affairs of America and Indo-China

²⁶ There is no contemporary record of it in the records of the Department of State; no entry of it was made in the files of notes to the French legation; nor was any intimation of the proposal sent to the American legation at Paris.

²⁷ While the naval forces in the Far East in 1867 were considerable, consisting of thirteen vessels (C. O. Paullin, in *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, XXXVII. 1137), they would not have been adequate to bear a fair share in effective coercive measures against Korea.

in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1873 he had become minister in Peking, and found some amusement in twitting his colleague the American minister, Frederick F. Low, on the characteristically self-righteous tone of existing American policy. He showed Low the original draft prepared by him in 1867, let him take a copy of it, and told him that the French cabinet, "after making some unimportant changes in the phraseology, without affecting the sense, directed it to be copied and sent".²⁸ The draft finally arranged reads thus:

M. Berthemy à Washington.

29 Mars 1867.

Mr., Vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'écrire le 3 de ce mois que le Gouvernement des États Unis projetant une expédition destinée à venger l'incendie du bâtiment de commerce américain "le *Gnl. Sherman*" et le massacre de son équipage par les habitants de la Corée, M. le Secrétaire d'État vous avait demandé si nous serions disposés à nous y associer afin d'obtenir pour notre part une satisfaction plus complète du meurtre de nos Missionnaires et de contraindre ensuite les Coréens à accepter un traité conforme à ceux qui ont été conclus avec la Chine et le Japon.

Les forces navales de S. M. ont au mois d'Octobre dernier infligé à ces populations une leçon dont nous avons lieu de croire qu'elles conserveront le souvenir, et que nous considérons comme un châtement suffisant, ainsi que vous l'avez du reste justement pressenti et indiqué par avance dans votre conversation avec M. Seward. Ce coup de main, car l'expédition de M. l'Amiral Roze ne devait pas avoir d'autre caractère, a été exécuté dans toutes les conditions d'opportunité désirables, c.à.d., à son heure immédiatement après l'attentat qui l'avait appelé. Il a pourvu à ce que nous désirions. Nos intérêts en Asie étant dès lors sauvegardés l'unique motif pour une action commune serait donc d'affirmer par l'union des deux pavillons la sympathie mutuelle et constante qu'attire l'un vers l'autre le peuple français et le peuple américain. Aussi notre premier mouvement nous eut-il porté à accepter avec le plus cordial empressement les ouvertures de M. Seward qui répondaient si bien à tout que nos sentiments ont de plus intime. Mais le Gouv't. de l'Empereur n'a pas à tenir compte seulement de ses impressions et de ses entraînements. Il doit peser avec maturité des résolutions qui peuvent mettre en cause dans une mesure considérable sa responsabilité vis-à-vis de l'opinion publique. En France les esprits ne sont pas favorables aujourd'hui à des entreprises dont le but éloigné et le caractère indéterminé ne pourraient permettre de préciser dès le début l'étendue et la durée. Le Gt. de S.M. ne se croit donc pas en mesure de s'engager dans une expédition dont le résultat ne pourrait pas être immédiat et qui, dans le premier moment, ne serait peut-être pas accueillie avec toute la faveur qu'elle mérite sans doute. Dans un pays où l'opinion publique pèse d'un si grand

²⁸ Low to Secretary Fish, Feb. 1, 1873, enclosing Geofroy's draft. This draft has been corrected, at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris, by the kindness of officials there and of Mr. Waldo G. Leland, into conformity with the draft finally arranged. The despatch actually sent appears not to be at the embassy in Washington—is perhaps in Paris.

poids sur toutes les affaires et avec un ministre d'un esprit élevé et d'un sens pratique comme M. Seward de telles considérations ont chance d'être immédiatement comprises.

Nous n'en apprécions pas moins l'intention amicale qui a inspiré les propositions de M. Seward, et nous y voyons un témoignage de cordialité dont je vous charge de le remercier. Vous voudrez bien aussi lui faire connaître que nous formons des vœux pour la réussite de l'expédition projetée et que, si en châtiant un acte de barbarie les armes des États Unis parviennent à réaliser dans ces contrées lointaines un progrès nouveau et à faire faire un pas de plus à la civilisation, nous serons les premiers à nous en réjouir et à y applaudir.

Vous êtes autorisé à donner lecture de cette dép. à M. le Secrétaire d'État.

The publication of the Bellonet-Kung correspondence in Peking and the practical failure of the expedition of Admiral Roze had greatly alarmed both Burlingame and the British minister, Sir Rutherford Alcock. It was rumored and generally believed in China that in the following spring France would send a powerful expedition to the peninsula to make a second attack. Sir Rutherford Alcock was prepared to attend, whether invited or not, with a British naval force to protect British interests, and Burlingame urged Seward (December 15, 1866) to instruct him to join with Alcock. He wrote: "If my advice can have any weight it will be that our presence there should rather restrain than promote aggression, and serve to limit action to such satisfaction only as great and civilized nations should, under the circumstances, have from the ignorant and the weak."²⁹ Seward, having satisfied himself that France had been misrepresented at Peking, and that no hostile measures were being contemplated, assured Burlingame that such instructions were unnecessary. He then turned to the question of a treaty with Korea, which he set out to secure in a more characteristically American fashion. His nephew, George F. Seward, was consul general at Shanghai. Young Seward, who was energetic and ambitious and subsequently was American minister at Peking, reported the presence in Shanghai of some alleged Korean envoys who had indicated a willingness on the part of the Korean government to enter into a treaty. The nephew requested from his uncle a commission to proceed to Korea and attempt negotiations. This request was granted; in the instructions issued there is a paragraph which fitly expresses the spirit of the policy which Seward would doubtless have liked to pursue from the beginning had he not supposed himself to be embarrassed by the ambitions of France. He wrote:

The design of this government is to render your visit a generous and friendly one, reserving the question of force, if found necessary.

²⁹ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1867, I. 426.

for ultimate consideration. You will not be expected therefore either to direct the exercise or make any display of force by way of intimidation, but on the other hand you will be expected to practise discretion, prudence and patience, while firmly asserting the dignity and maintaining the demands of the United States. You will, however, give notice to the Korean Government if you find it expedient, that this government cannot suffer the outrage committed in the case of the *General Sherman* to remain indefinitely without receiving proper guaranty of adequate and ample redress.³⁰

The proposed expedition by George F. Seward was never undertaken, for before the arrival of the instructions he had discovered that he had been duped by the alleged Korean envoys. Furthermore two American war-vessels, the *Wachusett* (Commander R. W. Shufeldt) and the *Shenandoah* (Commander John C. Febiger) had visited Korea since the disappearance of the *General Sherman*, but neither of them had brought back information indicating that a treaty with Korea at that time could be obtained by peaceful negotiations.³¹

It was very fortunate for the good name of the United States in Asia that Seward's proposal of a joint armed expedition to coerce Korea and to obtain satisfaction for the *General Sherman* failed. Nearly twenty years later it was learned from what appear to have been reliable Korean sources that the crew of the *General Sherman* brought their unhappy fate upon themselves. During a freshet the schooner had entered the Ta-dong River, and had grounded when the river suddenly fell. The crew, which was heavily armed, misunderstood the advances of the Korean authorities and treated them with indignities, whereupon the Koreans set out some fire-rafts to drift down upon the schooner, setting it on fire. The crew attempted to defend itself, but was overcome by the Koreans and put to death. The *General Sherman* had no legal right whatever to be in the river, and the action of the crew appears to have invited trouble.³²

At the moment when Seward made his seemingly impulsive suggestion to Berthemy about Korea, he was already contemplating the purchase of Alaska. The acquisition of Russian America had been one of the unfinished pieces of business which he had inherited from the Buchanan administration.³³ The energetic secretary did not per-

³⁰ Despatches to Consuls, vol. 49, p. 267; *For. Rel.*, 1870, pp. 336-339.

³¹ C. O. Paullin, "The Opening of Korea by Commodore Shufeldt", in *Political Science Quarterly*, XXV. 471-473.

³² Korea Despatches, vol. 2, Mar. 29, 1885, Foulk to Chandler, secretary of the navy, filed by date; Griffis, *Corea* (eighth ed., 1907), p. 395, note.

³³ Frank A. Golder, "The Purchase of Alaska", in *Amer. Hist. Review*, XXV. 411 ff.; James M. Callahan, "The Alaska Purchase", *West Va. Univ. Studies in Amer. Hist.*, series I, nos. 2 and 3, Feb.-Mar., 1908.

mit the matter to drop out of mind. He realized its value as a means of communicating with Asia when he indorsed (May 14, 1864) the memorial of Perry McD. Collins to the Senate, asking for a subsidy and other government aid for the construction of a telegraph line from the Pacific Coast northward through British Columbia, and thence across Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, down the Siberian coast to the mouth of the Amur River.³⁴

Stoeckl, the Russian minister, returned to the United States and landed in New York about February 1, 1867, where he remained for six weeks while his emissaries urged the purchase of Alaska upon Seward. There can be little doubt that in the month which elapsed between the arrival of Stoeckl in New York and the proposal to Berthemy in Washington, Seward, who required little urging, had already decided to acquire Alaska and the Aleutian Islands which stretched out so far toward the coast of Asia. Although he failed to conceal his eagerness to consummate the transaction, Seward very carefully concealed from Stoeckl his reasons for favoring the purchase of the peninsula, just as he had concealed from Berthemy his full purpose in the Korean matter. The conjunction of the two negotiations at least makes reasonable the conjecture that the purchase of Alaska was a piece of Far Eastern policy the full significance of which is not yet realized. A glance at the globe and a reference to the *Alaska Coast Pilot*³⁵ will show that the nearest good American harbor to the coast of Northern Asia is far out in the Aleutian Islands, at Kiska. The interest of Japan in the American possession of Kiska harbor may be noted in the fact that in Article XIX., Section I., of the Five-Power Naval Treaty of 1922, the United States, while excepting the insular possessions of the United States adjacent to the Alaskan coast, agrees to maintain the *status quo* as regards fortifications in the Aleutian Islands. If the co-operative policy in the East now re-established for the fourth or fifth time in seventy-five years were to fail, as it failed in the nineties, and if the United States were again to set out by isolated action to protect its interests in Eastern Asia as it did then by retaining the Philippines, it is probable that the line of American advance would be over the bridge to which "Seward's Folly" points.

With the purchase of Alaska and the proposed Korean expedition were associated the appropriation of the Midway Islands by the

³⁴ *Papers relating to the Intercontinental Telegraph*: Seward to the Committee of Commerce of the Senate, *Sen. Ex. Doc.* 123, 38 Cong., 1 sess.

³⁵ *U. S. Coast Pilot, Alaska*, 1916, pt. II., p. 222: "Kiska harbor is closed to foreign shipping".

United States in the same year³⁶ and the reaffirmation of the policy that the annexation of the Sandwich Islands was, under certain conditions, desirable.³⁷ Indeed after his departure from the Department of State Seward stated to the citizens of Salem, Oregon (August, 1869), that the United States ought to "own and possess self-producing [*sic*] islands on your coast and sugar and coffee-producing islands in both oceans".³⁸ The testimony of his son, Frederick W. Seward, who was so closely associated with his father in 1867, leaves little doubt that the purchase of Alaska was less a commercial than a political venture: "During its [Civil War] continuance my father, as Secretary of State, had found the government laboring under great disadvantages from the lack of advanced naval outposts in the West Indies and the North Pacific. So, at the close of hostilities, he commenced his endeavors to obtain such a foothold in each quarter."³⁹

A survey of Seward's eight-year record in the Department of State leads inevitably to the conclusion that, so far as Far Eastern matters were concerned, he was the greatest secretary after Daniel Webster. Indeed he stands above all his successors until John Hay, and far more than Hay he had the ability to follow a policy through when beset with difficulties. His policy respecting Chinese immigration, a domestic more than a foreign question, lacked statesmanship, but on the problems of American relations in the Pacific and in Asia he had a firm grip. Where his successors dodged or evaded the problem of co-operation he met it boldly. In his record there stands a list of very un-American actions; these were the price he paid for co-operating with powers possessed of very different ideals and purposes in the East. That he would have liked to do differently is evident from his final instructions for the treaty with Korea, and from the whole tone and content of the Burlingame treaty with China, which he himself wrote. There is this to be said in extenuation of his faults, that he had the courage to attempt to sustain American interests among the powers in the Far East. None of his successors in office in the nineteenth century had so much courage; most of them evaded entirely the problem which has now become one of the most difficult in all American foreign policy. Under Seward's policy of co-operation, American interests in the East advanced to a point from which they steadily receded after his day until the close of the cen-

³⁶ *Sen. Ex. Doc.* 79, 40 Cong., 2 sess.; *Sen. Report* 194, 40 Cong., 3 sess.; Moore, *Digest*, I. 555.

³⁷ *Dipl. Corr.*, 1894, app. II., p. 144; Moore, *Digest*, I. 484, note.

³⁸ *Works*, V. 577 ff.

³⁹ F. W. Seward, *Reminiscences of a War-time Statesman and Diplomat*, p. 360.

tury, when the American government resumed the policy of co-operation. On the other hand in the proposed Korean expedition from which England was to be excluded, and in the secrecy which attended the purchase of Alaska, Seward approached dangerously close to bad faith toward the other powers with which the United States was committed to co-operation. A co-operative policy could not long survive where one power was dealing behind the backs of the others. One would hardly commend Seward's Palmerstonian methods of statecraft as models for the statesmen of the twentieth century.

It is significant and worthy of note, that when the United States set out again upon co-operation, John Hay found his model, not in Seward's policy in Japan or his policy of 1867 as to Korea, but in Burlingame's frank, kindly, and irenic policy in China.

TYLER DENNETT.

DOCUMENTS

1. *An Unidentified Article by Talleyrand, 1796*¹

THE following article was printed on February 26, 1796, in the *Courrier de la France et des Colonies*, a French newspaper published in Philadelphia.

On February 15, 1796, Talleyrand, who, barred from France by a decree of emigration and forced to leave England under the terms of the Alien Act, had come to the United States and taken up his residence in Philadelphia, sent the following note to his friend, Moreau de Saint-Méry, ex-Constituent, and since 1794 a printer and bookseller in Philadelphia:

Je vais vous envoyer un morceau pour votre feuille de demain; ce sont deux pages assez piquantes. Gardez-leur de la place. Ce sera fort mal écrit, parceque vos plumes ne sont pas assez fendues.

Bon jour—Quoi de nouveau?

Envoyez-moi un de vos jeunes gens dans une heure chercher ma mauvaise écriture.²

The sheet referred to is the already mentioned *Courrier de la France et des Colonies* of Philadelphia, published by Gateau of Santo Domingo and printed by Moreau de Saint-Méry. This journal, which had appeared intermittently since September 19, 1793,³ was a four-page quarto newspaper, designed like the *Étoile Américaine* of Philadelphia and the *Gazette Française et Américaine* of New York to find a reading public among the émigrés from France and the French fugitives from Santo Domingo.

An examination of the file of the *Courrier* in the Boston Athenaeum, probably the only one in existence, disclosed an article entitled "Réflexions sur les Dernières Nouvelles reçues d'Europe particulièrement sur celles relatives à la France". It is unsigned, but that it is the article of Talleyrand's letter there can be no doubt.

In the first place, in the copies published between February 15, 1796, the date of Talleyrand's note to Moreau, and March 14, 1796, when the paper ceased to be published, there is no other article which could possibly be that mentioned by Talleyrand. The meagre issues

¹ Contributed by the late Lieutenant Ralph B. Yewdale, assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin, who died Nov. 24, 1921.

² Moreau de Saint-Méry, *Voyage aux États-Unis de l'Amérique, 1793-1798*, edited by Stewart L. Mims (New Haven, 1913), p. 220.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.

are filled with clippings from French and English newspapers, a serial account of adventures under the Terror, and the like.

The article in question, if allowance is made for the advertisements, covers almost exactly two pages. "Ce sont deux pages," says Talleyrand.

Furthermore, the resemblance between the style of the "Réflexions" and that of Talleyrand's *Essai sur les Avantages à retirer des Colonies Nouvelles dans les Circonstances Présentes* and his *Mémoire sur les Relations Commerciales des États-Unis avec l'Angleterre*, two papers read before the Institute and published soon after his return to France, is unmistakable.

Conclusive evidence, however, for ascribing the authorship of the "Réflexions" to Talleyrand, is to be found in the content of the article itself. A considerable portion of the article is devoted to a consideration of the finances of France, a subject in which Talleyrand had been keenly interested, both as agent-general of the clergy before the Revolution and as a member of the Constituent Assembly. It was he who had moved in the Constituent Assembly to confiscate the church lands in order to save the state from bankruptcy; he had spoken repeatedly on subjects connected with the national finances, and he had opposed the excessive issue of assignats and foretold their fate.⁴ A comparison of the text of the "Réflexions" with the quotations from Talleyrand's speeches which I have printed in the foot-notes will show that they were written by the same man.

The article is of interest since, unsigned as it is, it indicates Talleyrand's honest opinion of the Directory and of the financial condition of France on the eve of his return to Europe, where he was soon to become Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic.

RALPH BAILEY YEWDALE.

RÉFLEXIONS SUR LES DERNIÈRES NOUVELLES REÇUES D'EUROPE ET PARTICULIÈREMENT SUR CELLES RELATIVES À LA FRANCE

Sans même parler de l'ancienneté de ces nouvelles, dont les plus récentes s'arrêtent au 7 Décembre dernier, il serait bien difficile d'en tirer aucun résultat probable en politique, puisque sur des points d'une importance générale, la contradiction paraît de toute part. Il semble, lorsqu'on lit les extraits des quelques gazettes qui se sont comme échappées de France ou d'Angleterre pour irriter notre curiosité plutôt que pour la satisfaire, qu'on ait entrepris la tâche, aussi bizarre qu'impossible, de complaire successivement à tous les partis, à toutes les opinions, et de laisser, en dernière analyse, flotter les esprits dans l'incertitude où ils nagent depuis plusieurs années. On quitte cette lecture avec un soupir

⁴ *Archives Parlementaires*, première série, VIII. 498; IX. 398 ff.; XVI. 211 ff.; XXI. 401 ff.; XXVII. 144 ff., 351 ff.

vers l'avenir, et lorsqu'un jour de plus a encore déçu l'attente qu'il avait fait concevoir, notre pensée appelle le lendemain pour lui confier de nouvelles espérances. C'est ainsi que courant sans cesse après une ombre fugitive, nous accusons le tems de ne pas seconder assez notre impatience, sans réfléchir que chaque mouvement de ses ailes ravit quelque chose à notre existence, et que sa course n'a pas toujours pour but celle que lui indiquent nos désirs.

Cependant à travers cet amas indigeste de détails recueillis avec empressement et publiés avec le projet de remplir les papiers-nouvelles, il est quelques événemens qui semblent ne pas permettre le doute.

C'est ainsi que nous devons croire que la fureur des élémens s'est en quelque sorte combinée avec celle des hommes pour augmenter les désastres. Les vagues en furie ont englouti ceux qui étaient destinés à aller porter au loin les ravages de la mort, et des êtres qui se confiaient aux flots pour aller verser le sang de leurs ennemis sur des bords éloignés, ont perdu la vie, avant de quitter les propres bords de leur pays, tout couverts de leurs cadavres défigurés. La mer s'est apaisée, mais la colère d'Albion subsiste et elle recueille des débris pour les faire servir encore, si elle le peut, à l'exécution de ses projets.

Sur les bords du Rhin, où l'on dit que la victoire capricieuse vole de l'une à l'autre rive, le sang humain ruisselle et cette déchirante vérité est la seule que nous sachions bien.

Ah! quels vœux ardents pour la paix des maux aussi longs et aussi multipliés doivent faire naître dans tous les coeurs sensibles! et s'il en est d'assez atroces pour que la haine s'y nourrisse encore, qu'ils soient, s'il est possible, les seuls à éprouver les horreurs d'aussi longues calamités, et qu'un repos dont l'humanité a si grand besoin ajoute, s'il le faut, à leurs impuissantes fureurs!

Comme nous pensons que beaucoup de nos lecteurs attachés par plusieurs liens à la France n'auront pas lu, sans une grande attention, ce que les travaux de la nouvelle législature ont produit, nous leur offrirons ici quelques observations que nous avons entendu faire sur des actes émanés d'elle.

Celui qui porte un caractère vraiment remarquable, c'est le décret qui établit des notes qu'on échange contre les assignats à un pour trente.

Il est impossible de se dissimuler que depuis long-tems la multiplicité des assignats les dépréciait et que leur dépréciation contraignait à son tour à les multiplier. Ainsi tournant dans ce cercle vicieux, il fallait absolument qu'il arrivât un moment où, périssant de leur propre nullité, les assignats eussent le sort de tout papier-monnoye forcé:⁵ cette crise

⁵ Cf. the speech of Talleyrand, Dec. 4, 1789: "L'effet inévitable de tout papier-monnaie, vous le savez, Messieurs, est la prompte disparition des espèces. Ce numéraire fictif chasse le numéraire réel, et parce qu'il le remplace, et parce qu'il l'effraye; et, comme il ne peut jamais en être la représentation parfaitement exacte, il arrive qu'il en chasse beaucoup plus qu'il n'en remplace. Dès lors, ce papier ne se soutient plus à l'égalité de l'argent; il tombe au-dessous de pair, et de là les plus funestes conséquences." *Archives Parlementaires*, X. 383.

"L'Assemblée nationale ordonnera-t-elle une émission de deux milliards d'assignats-monnaie? On préjuge du succès de cette seconde émission, par le succès de la première . . . ; faire militer ce premier succès, qui même n'a pas été complet, puisque les assignats perdent, en faveur d'une seconde et plus ample émission, c'est s'exposer à de grands dangers . . ." Speech of Sept. 18, 1790. *Id.*, XIX. 49.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—5.

salutaire est arrivée. Nous disons salutaire, car il ne s'agit plus de chercher si les circonstances actuelles ont pu être évitées ou non, ni de s'ériger en juge des causes et des effets d'une grande révolution, pour établir une hypothèse et en faire marcher les conséquences sur le papier; il faut prendre les circonstances au point où elles sont parvenues. Et c'est alors qu'on ne peut nier que l'anéantissement des assignats est un bien.

Leur valeur décroissant chaque jour, il est sûr que l'ouvrier qui, pour son labeur, avait reçu, au commencement d'un mois, une somme supérieure à sa dépense, et qui conservait l'excédant, se trouvait n'avoir rien économisé au commencement du mois suivant, parce que les assignats avaient continué à perdre, et qu'il devait arriver par l'effet de la misère générale, que son travail n'était plus suffisant pour le faire vivre.⁶ C'était déjà et depuis long-tems le sort de presque tous les rentiers, classe sur laquelle les assignats avaient le plus d'influence, puisque recevant des arrérages en assignats, au taux légal, ils voyaient, à chaque paiement, leurs revenus disparaître sans pouvoir rien opposer à ce malheur.⁷ Enfin les assignats étaient avilis à un tel point, que les frais que leur fabrication exigeait ne pouvaient plus être payés par eux.

On ne cherche point à se dissimuler que cet instant qui réduit nécessairement l'*assignat* au taux des *notes* ne soit douloureux, c'est celui d'une opération qui rappelle à la vie un corps que des crises lentes mais continuelles allaient paralyser.

Mais, dira-t-on, tous les moyens, toutes les ressources, toutes les fortunes sont détruites, car il n'est pas personne qui ne possède une quantité quelconque d'assignats, et qui n'éprouve ainsi une perte plus ou moins sensible, et cette secousse causée aux fortunes particulières doit détruire la fortune publique.

A cela l'on peut répondre par deux grands exemples. C'est que la France n'a pas péri à la chute du système de Law.

C'est que l'Amérique n'a pas péri lorsque son congrès a prononcé que son papier-monnoye n'aurait plus d'autre valeur que celle qu'il avait

⁶ Cf. the speech of Talleyrand, Sept. 18, 1790, *Archives Parl.*, XIX. 50: "Je dis que l'abondance des assignats doit appauvrir les manouvriers de tout genre et nuire par conséquent au succès des manufactures et à la prospérité des campagnes. J'insiste sur cette considération, parce que le danger dont je parle menace le pauvre et le menace tous les jours et à toutes les heures.

"Point de richesses sans travail, point de travail sans consommation.

"Puisqu'il faut produire avant de consommer, il faut donc que le prix du travail soit acquitté avant que le manouvrier consume.

"Mais le prix du travail étant modique, journalier, applicable aux premiers besoins de la vie, il ne peut jamais être payé qu'avec des monnaies, et le papier ne peut remplir aucune fonction à cet égard. Cependant les assignats auront augmenté le prix de tous les objets de consommation; et les salariés, restés au même taux, lorsque toutes les valeurs seront peut-être doublées autour d'eux, seront d'autant plus pauvres, d'autant plus malheureux, qu'ils auront produit davantage; car si tout renchérit, la consommation sera moindre, et le travail venant ensuite à diminuer, il est impossible que les salaires augmentent."

⁷ Cf. the speech of Talleyrand, Dec. 4, 1789, *ibid.*, X. 383-384: "Tous les créanciers que l'on rembourse en billets perdent la différence; tous les débiteurs à qui l'on avait prêté en argent la gagnent: par conséquent, renversement dans les propriétés, infidélité universelle dans les paiements, et infidélité d'autant plus odieuse qu'elle se trouve légale."

à l'époque du décret, c'est-à-dire, *un* pour *quarante* relativement à l'argent monnoyé.

On demandera ensuite où est pour les notes une garantie plus forte que dans les assignats? Elle est dans les biens nationaux dont la vente est suspendue pour que l'hypothèque soit connue et conservée. Mais elle est bien plus encore dans l'établissement d'un gouvernement qui, dès son principe, annonce clairement qu'il ne veut pas que les maux produits par les assignats s'aggravent et se sent assez fort pour proposer une opération douloureuse au moment où elle est un moyen curatif pour le corps politique.

Cette énergie qui est un grand moyen d'inspirer la confiance produira celle qu'on paraît vouloir faire entretenir et nourrir par des compagnies financières qui, trouvant dans une hypothèque réelle une base solide pour leurs opérations, sauront faire partager des sentimens qu'elles auront conçu elles-mêmes.

D'ailleurs n'est-il pas notoire qu'une des causes qui a le plus accéléré l'avisement des assignats a été la concurrence dans laquelle ils se sont trouvés avec la monnaie métallique?⁸ Et puisque cette dernière a reparu dès qu'on le lui a permis, si elle est déjà assez commune pour que beaucoup de transactions n'aient plus lieu que par son moyen, pourquoi ne se montrerait-elle pas avec plus d'abondance lorsque tous les soins du gouvernement l'y exciteront? Le numéraire de la France n'est pas tombé au fond d'un abysme. Tout ce que la terreur avait enfoui doit reparaitre lorsqu'il n'y a plus de terreur; ce qui [qu'il] avait transporté dans les contrées étrangères, reviendra, puisque l'on peut désormais être riche et industriel en France, sans courir le risque de monter à l'échafaud.⁹

Pour produire tant d'heureux effets, une seule chose suffit, la confiance: et l'on peut répéter que celle avec laquelle la législature compte sur l'esprit public est suffisante pour donner la plus heureuse impulsion à ce grand moyen de gouvernement.

Il faudrait avoir bien réfléchi sur ce qui s'est passé à l'époque de l'exécrable Robespierre et à celle qui l'a suivie, pour ne pas reconnaître dans les principes actuels d'autres vues, et dans ce qu'ils ont déjà produit de grands sujets d'espérer. Un trait entr'autres en fera bien juger.

La législature, calculant que la paix qu'elle veut doit ramener à l'état de simple citoyen des individus dont la paye militaire est peut-être l'unique ressource, met en réserve pour l'armée un milliard, destiné à être tout à la fois et récompense et moyen d'exister. Et pour qu'on soit bien convaincu qu'elle croit que chacun concourra avec elle au rétablissement de l'ordre, elle met en dépôt entre les mains de chaque département une portion de ce milliard. Ce n'est plus une seule cité s'arrogant

⁸ Cf. the speech of Talleyrand, Sept. 18, 1790, *ibid.*, XIX, 51: "Il n'existe dans la réalité qu'une monnaie dominante dans ce moment, c'est l'argent. Si vous donnez cours au papier, ce sera le papier. Vous ordonnerez que ce papier ne perde pas, j'y consens; mais vous n'empêcherez pas que l'argent ne gagne, et ce sera absolument la même chose."

⁹ Cf. the speech of Talleyrand, Dec. 4, 1789, *ibid.*, X, 385: "Ce n'est qu'en commandant l'opinion, en donnant des motifs déterminants de confiance, que l'on assure le crédit; et si l'on craint que, même après le rétablissement de l'ordre, le numéraire qui semble s'être évanoui au milieu de nous ne reparaisse pas, on se trompe."

la suprématie; ce n'est plus Paris disant : *Moi seule je suis la République entière* et réservant toujours tout pour se l'appliquer ou pour s'en arroger l'emploi. Ici chaque département est associé à la distribution des bienfaits; chacun d'eux est dépositaire et gardien d'un moyen de puissance dont on ne croit plus qu'il puisse abuser, et pour lui prouver qu'on ne veut plus y produire de commotions, on lui destine à l'avance des moyens de calme et de bonheur. On ne rivalise plus, ou bien c'est seulement de désir de faire sortir la France de l'état où l'ont jettée des hommes qui souffraient tout de ceux qu'ils n'osaient pas envoyer à la mort.

Une autre preuve que le gouvernement a le sentiment de sa force, c'est la suppression des réquisitions militaires au moment même où le directoire exécutif se plaint d'une désertion allarmante. On se contente de mettre la force armée à sa disposition dans les cas indispensables. Voilà donc l'action du pouvoir exécutif sur tout citoyen quand il doit devenir soldat, organisée; et tant que la France aura des ennemis elle aura des défenseurs. Il ne faut pour les faire accourir par milliers que leur parler de l'infamie de recevoir une loi étrangère.

Et ce directoire exécutif il a aussi le sentiment de son importance. On a amèrement censuré le langage qu'il a pris avec les ministres étrangers et l'on a même cru que c'était lui qu'on injurait en comparant ceux-ci à des écoliers, mais il a dit en parlant à l'ambassadeur de Suède, *Les Chefs de la République Française*, et quand une grande nation, célèbre par sa valeur, est revenue, par un mouvement d'horreur pour les crimes par lesquels on s'est efforcé de la déshonorer pendant deux années, à n'avoir plus d'autre besoin que d'être libre et tranquille, ses chefs peuvent la rendre respectable aux yeux des autres nations, et la diriger de manière à convaincre ces dernières qu'elles doivent perdre l'espoir et de la soumettre et de l'exciter encore à se déchirer de ses propres mains.

Encore on est frappé d'un décret qui fait sortir des prisons, pour venir s'asseoir à leur rang de députés, des hommes, livrés à des accusations qui autrefois étaient presque toujours un signal de mort.

Ce qui nous plaît le plus de toutes ces remarques c'est qu'elles semblent faites pour fortifier encore l'espérance de la paix. Car comment concevoir l'idée d'une tranquillité durable en France, si la paix ne vient pas y ramener l'abondance en y rendant d'innombrables bras à l'agriculture, des hommes industriels aux manufactures, d'utiles spéculations au commerce? Elle seule peut y reproduire les biens qui en feraient encore un des lieux les plus délicieux à habiter, où les arts et les jouissances agréables, réunis aux douceurs de son climat, attireraient, comme autrefois, des habitants de toutes les autres contrées.

2. James K. Polk and his Constituents, 1831-1832

In the Polk Papers in the Library of Congress is a modest booklet, made evidently by fastening together some sheets of folded writing-paper of note size.¹ In the cover is stamped "Congress U. S." in raised letters with a chaste border, indicating the source from which the paper was obtained. In the book were entered, day after day, a series of items describing a kind of service that every congressman performs and few ever have the patience or the candor to

¹ Polk Papers, Library of Congress, vol. 7, nos. 1245-1258.

describe on paper. That Polk gives into the confidence of this little book such a picture is as characteristic of him as it is fortunate for those who wish to see how a congressman discharged a certain important part of his duties. No man who has been a president of the United States, not even John Quincy Adams, was more methodical or more conscientious in the discharge of his official duty. Perhaps he inherited the impulse from his Scotch-Irish ancestry, for it is a Scotch-Irish trait to be downright—although one must admit that there were other members of the Polk family who were neither methodical nor painstaking. But James K. Polk did not shirk a duty. His ideals were not very elevated, but such as they were he never shirked them. To attend to the little necessities of his constituents exactly comported with his ideal of a congressman's duty. His little book shows what was the nature of these requests. It is reprinted here just as he wrote it (save for slight amendments of punctuation) and without comment or explanation.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

MEMORANDUM BOOK OF BUSINESS DONE FOR CONSTITUENTS
1ST SESSION OF THE 22ND CONGRESS.

John Dysart

Received petition and affidavit for a Pension, from *John Dysart Snr.* of Bedford C[oun]ty, near Farmington. *Wrote to him Decr. 7, 1831* that his case was not embraced by the present Pension Laws, and that I would present his papers to Congress for special relief. Presented and referred to committee on Revolutionary Pensions Decr. 14, '31.

S. W. Carmack Esqr.

Wrote to Commissioner of Genl Land office and enclosed \$1.00. to procure [?] the information desired by S. W. Carmack Esqr. (see Mr. Carmack's letter)—Decr. 7th, 1831.

Procured and enclosed to Mr. Carmack, map and description of the $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. of land desired. Decr. 14, '31.

Allen B. Mc. Elhany

Enclosed to Com. of Genl Land office, letters and affidavits of Allen B. Mc. Elhany of Elkton, Tenn., for the purpose of procuring a duplicate or copy of Patent for bounty land. Mr. M's letter to me dated Nov. 25, 1831. Decr. 9, '31.

Procured copy of Patent and enclosed it to Mr. Mc.Elheny to Elkton, Giles C[oun]ty, Ten. Decr. 14, '31.

Rock Creek P.O. Bedford C[oun]ty

Enclosed to P.M. Genl petition enclosed to me by Dr. G. W. Haywood from a number of the citizens of Bedford C[oun]ty, for the Establishment of a Post Office at the house of *Samuel Bigham*, to be called *Tusculum* P.O. *S. Bigham* P. Master. Decr. 10, 1831.

Jan'y 7th. '32. Enclosed to Dr. Haywood notification from Genl P. O. that P.O. has been established, *S. Bigham* Esqr. called *Rock Creek*

P.O. instead of *Tusculum* there being another office of that name in the state.

Ahm. Parker and Lester Morris

Presented to the Ho. Repts. petition and documents heretofore presented, of Abraham Parker and Lester Morris praying for Pensions—referred to committee on Revolutionary Pensions, Decr. 14, 1831.

Bills for Pensions passed Ho. Repts. and sent to the Senate, Decr. 1831.

Col. Joseph Brown

Presented petition and documents of Col. Joseph Brown praying indemnity for property taken and destroyed by Cherokee Indians—referred to committee on Indian Affairs. Decr. 14, '31.

March 17th, '32. Enclosed to him favourable report.

Bernard M. Patterson

Presented petition of Bernard M. Patterson heretofore presented to Ho. Repts. praying the allowance of a balance claimed to be due in the settlement of his accounts as an Officer of the army—referred to committee of claims, Decr. 14, '31.

March 17th, '32. Enclosed to him report against claim and answered letter of 22nd Decr., stating the Mr. Woods letter was not to be found in dead-letter office, and enclosing letter from Genl. P.O. to that effect.

Elizabeth Owens

Petition and papers of Elizabeth Owens praying the allowance of arrears of pay due her brother James Shirly—heretofore presented—presented to Ho. Repts.—referred on motion of Hon. Mr. Whittlesley on Monday last to committee on claims. Wednesday, Decr. 14, '31.

Bill, allowing to Mrs. Owens \$110.78 passed the Ho. Repts. and sent to the Senate. Decr. 1831.

Bill finally passed and approved by the President March 15th, 1832. Wrote to Mrs. Owens enclosing copy. March 17th, '32.

Wm. A. Thompson

Decr. 14, '31. Enclosed to Wm. Gordon Esqr. Bounty land office, Wm. A. Thompson's papers, claiming bounty land as the heir at law of Capt. John Thompson of the Revolutionary army.

Decr. 29, '31. Enclosed to W. A. Thompson, Elkton, Ten. letter from Wm. Gordon of the Bounty land office, requiring proof that Capt. John Thompson belonged to the *Continental line*, his name not being found on the muster rolls.

Apr 11th, '32. Enclosed to him to Halifax C. H. Mr. Sarmiento's letter returned Gordons letter and sent copy of law of 1830, and informed him that further proof was required.

Joseph G. Pratt

Decr. 14, '31. Enclosed to Wm. Gordon Esqr. Bounty Land office, the petition and aff't. of Joseph G. Pratt of Williamsport, Maury C[oun]ty, Ten. in behalf of himself and others heirs at law of his brother Dabney Pratt decd. late a soldier etc. praying for bounty land.

Decr. 31st, '31. Enclosed to Mr. Pratt at Williamsport, letter from the Bounty Land office of the 30th Inst. requiring information as to the Company and Regt. in which *Dabny Pratt*, of the name of the officer who enlisted him, and also proof of kinship.

Saml. Baker

Decr. 14, '31. Enclosed to J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, Declaration and additional aff't of Capt. Matthew Wood in support of Saml. Baker's claim for a pension.

Decr. 18, '31. Pension granted, and wrote to Mr. Baker, enclosing his letter in one to Mjr. Jos. H. Rivers, giving him the information, directed to Pulaski Tenn.

Feby. 8th, '32. Enclosed pension certificate to Mr. Baker, to care of Majr. Rivers, as requested by his letter which see.

Hall Hudson

Decr. 14, 1831. Enclosed to J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, the Declaration and amended declaration of *Hall Hudson* for a pension.

Decr. 29, '31. Enclosed to *Hall Hudson*, Pulaski, Ten. Letter of J. L. Edwards of 20th Int. requiring proof of another witness as to the fact of service; and also to prove the insolvency of *David Sheldon*.

Decr. 30, '31. On reflection presented papers to Ho. Repts. and had them referred to committee on Revolutionary pensions.

Richard Taylor

Decr. 14, 1831. Enclosed to J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension papers in the case of *Richard Taylor*. These papers were handed to me by Col. Thos. K. Gordon at Cornersville July 5, 1831.

Decr. 19, 1831. Enclosed J. L. Edwards's answer rejecting the application and retaining the papers in the office, upon the ground, that Col. Thos. Drew under whom he served, did not belong to the *Continental* line, to Col. Thos. K. Gordon.

Thomas Debnam and Simon Jenkins

Decr. 16th, 1831. Handed to Wm. Gordon Esqr. Bounty land office, mem. in the cases of Thomas Debnam and Simon Jenkins, of Maury C[oun]ty, soldiers of the last war for Bounty Lands.

Jany. 2nd, 1832. Enclosed to *Thomas Debnam*, Maury C[oun]ty, letter from Bounty Land office Dated Decr. 28th, '31, stating that Patents issued both to Debnam and Jenkins for land in Missouri Jany. 4th, 1819, and on 9th same month were transmitted to J. G. Bradford of Nashville; and requiring aff't. that original had not been recd. before a copy would be issued to them. Jany. 12, '32. Wrote Debnam in regard to arrears of pay—(see letter from W. B. Lewis on file of date Jany. 3rd, '32).

George Maddox

Decr. 16, 1831. Handed to Wm. Gordon Esqr. Bounty Land office, discharge and memorandum of George Maddox for Bounty land as a soldier of the last war. Lives in Maury C[oun]ty.

Decr. 29th, '31. Wrote to Mr. *George Maddox* that the law did not allow him bounty land, he having enlisted prior to Decr. 24, 1811.

David Candle

Decr. 16, '31. Le[f]t at the office of Peter Hagner Esqr. 3rd Audtr. afft. of David Candle, for compensation and allowance for extra-services in the last war. Lives near Moorsville, Maury C[oun]ty.

Jany. 16, '32. Enclosed to *David Candle*, Moorsville, Ten. letter from P. Hagner of Decr. 16th, '31, and A. Kendall of Jany 13th, '32—both stating their offices contained no information in support of his claim.

Wm. Brown

Decr. 16, '31. Handed to J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, letter from Col. Yell and mem. stating that Pension papers had been sent to War Dept. by R. C. Thompson and desiring to know what decision had been made in the case. Lives in Bedford C[oun]ty.

Decr. 19, '31. Recd. answer in relation to *Thomas Brown* and wrote again to be informed as to *William Brown*.

Decr. 29, '31. Wrote to Mr. Wm. Brown, Shelbyville, that his pension papers were not on file in the War Dept.

Andrew Derryberry

Decr. 16, '31. Handed J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, letter of Andrew Derryberry of Perry County, desiring to know what decision had been made on his application for a pension, the papers for which were forwarded to the War Dept. some time since.

Decr. 19, '31. Enclosed answer of J. L. Edwards, that the application was rejected in Decr. 1827, and papers withdrawn by Col. Crockett in Feby. 1828.

Hartwell Miles

Decr. 16, '31. Handed to J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, additional afft. of James Patterson in support of the application of Hartwell Miles for an invalid Pension.

Decr. 21, '31. Enclosed further testimony recd. by mail this day.

Feby. 2d, '32. Enclosed to Mr. Miles letter from J. L. Edwards of Jany. 30th, '32, requiring further proof of the cause of his disability. Letter directed to Wm. son C[oun]ty, Hardman's Cross Roads, Ten.

Alex Pickard

Decr. 19th, '31. Presented to Ho. Repts. papers of Alexander Pickard, for invalid pension. Referred to committee on Invalid pensions.

Robert M. Smith

Decr. 19th, '31. Presented to Ho. Repts. petition of Robert M. Smith praying for bounty Land for his services during the last War.

John Vickers

Decr. 20th, 1831. Left with J. L. Edwards Esqr. Pension office, additional testimony in support of *John Vickers's* application for a pension.

Decr. 31st, '31. Wrote to Mr. Vickers, Lincoln C[oun]ty, that pension had been granted, and that pension certificate was in my possession.

Jan '32. Sent pension certificate to him by Mr. Kinsman.

P. Office at Richmond, Bedford C[oun]ty.

Decr. 21st, 1831. Enclosed to P.M. Genl. petition for P. office at *Richmond*, Bedford C[oun]ty, Tenn., between *Rock* and *Sinking Creek* at the store of *Thos. N. McClain* and recommending Mr. McClain for P. Master.

Jany. 7th, '32. Enclosed to Thos. N. McClain Esqr. Shelbyville, notification from Genl. P.O. that P.O. named *Richmond* had been established at his store and that he had been appointed P. Master.

Lemuel Perry

Lemuel Perry and wife—she is the sister of Midshipman J. N. Forsythe, lost on board the *Hornet*. Presented application for amt. Due him; Recd. from A. Kendall 4th Auditor and enclosed to Mr. Perry letter of 27th Decr. '31, requiring the affidavit of Mrs. Perry, that she is sister of decd., that he died without wife or children, and that his father and mother are dead. Decr. 29, '31 directed to Civil Order P.O. Bedford C[oun]ty.

March 3rd, '32. Enclosed to A. Kendall Mrs. Perry's afft. as required by his letter and requested the remittance to be made to her at Civil Order P.O.

March 10, '32. Wrote to Mr. Perry that claim was allowed for \$40.56, which would be forwarded by 4th Audr. in a few days (see Kendall's letter).

John Beaty

Decr. 29th, 1831. Wrote to Mr. *John Beaty*, Moorsville, Maury C[oun]ty, that the 2 accts. of his father Capt. *Hugh Beaty*, for services of himself and his company of militia in M. had been presented to P. Hagner, who gave for answer that no provision had ever been made by U. S. for settlement of such claims.

Jeremiah Dial

Decr. 30th, '31. Wrote to *Jeremiah Dial*, Bedford C[oun]ty, that his pension papers were not to be found on the files of the Ho. Repts.; having written to him also at the last Session of Congress that they were not in the Pension office; and now stating to him that he must make them out anew, and forward them, or I could do nothing for him.

Wm. P. Bradburn

Jany. 2nd, 1832. Procured *Midshipman's* warrant, of date Decr. 31st, 1831, for *William P. Bradburn*, and inclosed it to him to Nashville, Tennessee.

Sarah Larimore

Jany. 5th, 1832. Enclosed to P. Hagner additional testimony in support of the application of *Sarah Larimore* (now *Sarah Logan*) of Lincoln C[oun]ty, for half pay pension, as the widow of *Andrew Larimore*. Her present husband's name is *Wm. Logan* and resides in Lincoln C[oun]ty.

Jany. 12, '32. Recd. P. Hagner's letter (see on file) that claim was allowed, and wrote Mr. Hagner of this date, to remit it to the widow at Fayetteville, Ten. in a draft on the Bank of U.S. B. Bank at Nashville. Wrote to Wm. Logan care of Jessee Daniel Esqr. and also to Wm. D. Thompson giving them information of this.

Post office at Carmell, Bedford C[oun]ty.

Jany. 11th, '32. Returned petition and papers to S. R. Hobbie Esqr. Asst. P.M. Genl. inclosed to me on the 5th Inst., and recommended the establishment of P.O. at Carmell in Bedford County, Ten. and the appointment of *Chesley Williams* as P. Master. Wrote to *Jarvis Williams* Esqr. P.M. at Civil Order, same date, giving the foregoing information.

William Green

Jany. 14th, '32. Presented *William Green's* application for a Patent, to the Superintendent of Patent office. Recd. letter from him same

day, which I enclosed to Mr. Green, informing him that he must forward a *model* before a Patent could issue; that his drawings were imperfect and that it would cost \$10. more, in all \$40., which he must send on when he sends his model. Wrote to Columbia, Ten.

Apl. 4th, '32. Recd. letter enclosing \$40. and ansd. same.

May 4th, '32. Enclosed Mr. Green his Patent having paid \$38.00 fees, and having in my hands \$2.00 yet due him.

Thos. B. Coleman

Jany. 14, '32. Ansd. Thos. B. Coleman's letter, that he must forward proof of his father's service and draft in the army, and the proof of kinship, befor I could do any thing in his case. Wrote to *Spring Hill* P.O. Ten.

Solomon Campbell

Jany. 14, '32. Wrote to Secretary of War, requested that *Solomon Campbell's* application for a pension might be re-examined and decided on.

Jay. 18, '32. Recd. communication from War Dept. informing that a Pension had been granted to Mr. Campbell and enclosing Pension Certificate. Wrote to Mr. Campbell, to the care of Wm. Hackitt Esqr., directed to Shelbyville. Sent Pension certificate to Mr. Campbell by Col. K. L. Anderson of Shelbyville, March '32.

Col. Wm. Newsom

Feby. 27th, '32. Presented petition and papers of Wm. Newsom to House and had them refered to committee on Post office and Post Roads.

May 10th, '32. Enclosed to Col. Newsom copy of Rept. of committee, adverse to his claim together with copies of his accts. from Genl. P.O.

George Blakemore

Febry. 27th, '32. Presented petition of George Blakemore, praying for land in the Choctaw Country, in consideration of services performed, in the early settlement of the Western Country; refered to committee on the Public Lands.

Capt. John Madairis

March 8th, '32. Handed to Asbury Dickens the letter and inclosures of Capt. John Medairis for \$240, part of his pension which had been sent to him in the U.S.B. draft but which he had not received, accompanied by a statement of my own that the securities to the Bond of indemnity, to wit, Thos. Davis and Jno. and Spruces Eakin, were solvent.

March 10th, '32. Enclosed to W. D. Mediaris letter from Sec. of the Treas. and form of Bond of indemnity, the former bond not having been recd.

May 12, '32. Enclosed letter from Sec. of Treas. to W.D. Mediaris stating that old bond was lost, and requiring new one to be executed.

John P. Smith

March 6th, '32. Enclosed to Sec. of War letters of Thos. Watham Esqr. and John P. Smith, in relation to the claim of the latter to the value of an Indian Improvement in the Chickasaw Nation.

March 19th, '32. Enclosed to Thos. Watham letter from Sec. of War, stating that Fletcher's improvement had been paid for in full \$1047,

and that there was no evidence that *Moore* and *Irwin* were intitled to pay for improvements (see papers)—wrote also to Mr. Smith.

Col. Saml. Mitchell

March 6th, '32. Enclosed to Sec. of War letter of Col. Saml. Mitchell, in relation to contract which he denies, to furnish the choctaws West of Mississippi with certain improvements and articles provided for by the Treaty.

March 23rd, '32. Enclosed to Col. Mitchell letter from E. Herring, Bureau of Indian affairs of March 20th, stating that no contracts have been made, that they will not be until Gov. advertises for proposals, and that recommendations are satisfactory.

Jeremiah Dial

March 8th, 1832. Handed to Asbury Dickens, Jeremiah Dial's Pension papers forwarded to me, not having been able to find the papers sent on by Capt. McDuff several years ago.

March 27th, '32. Enclosed to Mr. Dial, letter from Sec. of Treas. of 20th Int., stating that the records of Dept. furnish no evidence of service and proof furnished does not shew that he served until end of the war: Requests him to state from whom he recd. the certificate for reward of \$80, as that may throw light on his case.

Capt. John Stone

March 8th, 1832. Handed to Peter Hagner Esqr. letter from Capt. John Stone of Shelbyville, Ten. inquiring what was due to his son and son-inlaw, for services during the last War, and for lost horse and equippage.

March 17th, '32. Wrote to Capt. Stone enclosing to him letters from the 2nd and 3rd Auditors of Treas. stating that the accts. of John Walker and Sect. Wm. Stone had been settled, and all that they were entitled to had been paid.

Rock Creek P.O. Bedford C[oun]ty, Ten.

March 8th, 1832. Handed to P.M. Genl. Petition from citizens and letter from Dr. Geo. W. Haywood, to have route from Franklin to Cornersville, so changed as to pass *Rock Creek P.O.*

March 22nd, '32. Enclosed to Dr. Haywood letter from A. B. Brown at Genl. P.O. stating that the contractor was directed visit "*Rock Creek P.O.*"

John Culver

March 12th, '32. Enclosed to J. L. Edwards letter of John Culver of Bedford C[oun]ty, inquiring what had been done with his application for a pension.

March 15th, '32. Wrote Mr. Culver that his pension papers were not on file in the Pension office.

James Roberts

March 12th, '32. Presented to Ho. Rept. petition of James Roberts of Jackson County, Ten. (forwarded to me by Mr. Thos. Smith) praying compensation for extra services performed as a carrier of the mail; referred to committee on P.O. and P. Roads.

P.O. at Belfast, Bedford County

March 14th, '32. Enclosed to P.M. Genl. letter of Benjm. Williams Esqr. of 27th Feby. '32, recommending the establishment of P.O. at McCrery's cross-roads, Bedford C[oun]ty, Ten. to be called "*Belfast P.O.*" and *Robert Williams* Esqr. to be appointed P.Master.

March 23rd, '32. Enclosed to Robert Williams notification of establishment of office, and his appointment as P. Master; enclosed to Macon P.O.

Cane Spring P.O.

March 17th, '32. P.O. to be established at the House of Col. Joseph Brown by 1st of May, when Danly's stages will commence running, to be called "*Cane Spring P.O.*" or "*Brown's cross roads P.O.*"

May—, '32. P.O. established at "*Cane Spring*", Joseph Brown P.M. and notification thereof enclosed to Col. Brown.

John Tipps's evidence

March 19th, '32. Enclosed to P. Hagner the papers in the case of the evidence of John Tipps decd. of Lincoln County, Ten. for half pay pension and arrearages of pay.

March 26, '32. Enclosed to Michael Tipps P. Hagner's answer stating that balance of pay due Jno. Tipps at his death \$14.40, was pd. by P. Master Searcy to Jacob Silvertooth his admr.

That for half pay pension proof must be furnished, that Mrs. Barbara Tipps the widow is still living, that she is or is not married a second time, as the case may be. She must also make an afft. herself, of the number of her children under 16 at her husband's death, that she has never drawn the pension and that it is for her sole use.

Zadoc Motlow and others

March 26, '32. Presented to Ho. Repts. and refered to Indian affairs, petition and documents of Zadoc Motlow and others, for indemnity for property destroyed by the Cherokee Indians in 1781.

William Porter

March 27th, '32. Wrote N. Porter and enclosed letter his father *Wm. Porter* stating that the Old Continental Bills sent on by me were of no value; that throgh Genl. Mercer the \$100. one had been sent to Richmond, and answer from Mr. Heath Audtr. of Public accts. recd. that it was of no value.

Apl. 4th, '32. Recd. letter from Wm. Porter and ansd. same, giving above information.

Horatio Coop

April 4th, 1832. Enclosed to Horatio Coop, Bedford C[oun]ty, Ten. Copy of letter from Sec. of Treas. to Col. Yell dated Augst. 1831, stating that there was not sufficient [evidence] that Mr. C. enlisted for the War and served until the close therof. Wrote him also giving same information, contained in my letter to him of Dcr. '30. (see memorandum).

Chas. C. Mayson Esqr.

April 4th, 1832. Ansd. C. C. Mayson's letter enclosing one from Sec. of Treasury and one from Mr. Gordon, Bounty land office, stating that the name of his father Lt. Col. James Mayson was not to be found on the records of either office, and that there was no evidence that he belonged to Continental Establishment, or recd. commutation certificate.

Wm. Throop

May 6th, '32. Wrote Mr. D. S. Shields that *Wm. Throop*, whose pension papers he enclosed me being now dead, his case was not provided for by law.

Henry Goodnight

May 6, 1832. Enclosed Henry Goodnight's Pension papers, accompanied with Mr. Wm. C. Flournay's letter, to J. L. Edwards Esqr.

May 12th, '32, wrote Mr. Goodnight that Pension had been granted, and that I had pension certificate in my possession and would bring it with me on my return home.

Wm. Brown (Bedford)

May 6, '32. Enclosed to Wm. Hill Esqr. Raleigh N.C. letter of J.L. Edwards and Declaration of Wm. Brown for a pension—for evidence of service; the letter of Mr. Edwards stating that the War Dept. furnished no evidence of service.

P.O. Bayler's Store, Lincoln C[oun]ty.

May 14th, '32. Recommended the establishment of P.O. at "*Bayler's Store*, Lincoln County, Ten. *Charles Bayler* Esqr. to be P. Master. This office is on Flynt near Esqr. McDavid's.

P.O. at True's Store, Maury C[oun]ty.

June 4th, '32. Enclosed to David H. True Esqr. (Swan Creek, Maury C[oun]ty) notification of his appointment as P.M. at True's Store, etc.

Wm. Stephens

June 11th, '32. Enclosed to Sec. of War recommendation from C.C. Mayson Esqr. and others, in favour of *William Stephens* for the appointment of Cadet at West Point.

Hickory P.O.

Enclosed letter of John Vinent Esqr. to the P.M. Genl. and recommended the Establishment of P.O. office at the House of J. Vinent in Maury C[oun]ty, to be called "*Hickory P.O.*" J. Vinent recommended as P. Master. Dcr. 12th, 1832.

Indian Creek P.O.

Enclosed to P.M. Genl. petition of citizens of Giles C[oun]ty for P.O. on Indian Creek and recommended Establishment of the office and that *Samul W. Ezell* Esqr. be appointed P. Master. Dcr. 11th, 1832.

Children of John Walker, Capt. John Stone

Jany. 2nd, 1822. Enclosed P. Hagner's letter of 15 Decr '32 in relation to claim of children of John Walker decd. for half pay Pension to Capt. John Stone of Shelbyville. Evidence required identifying the children and their own deposition that they have never reced. pay.

Capt. John Stone

Wrote also to Capt. Stone, that his claim for revolutionary services was a claim against the State of Pennsylvania and not against the U. States.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Der Dreieinige Gott in Religionshistorischer Beleuchtung. Von Dr. DITLEF NIELSEN, Unterbibliothekar an der Universitätsbibliothek zu Kopenhagen. I. Band. *Die Drei Göttlichen Personen.* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal; Christiania: Nordisk Forlag. 1922. Pp. xv, 472. Kr. 18.)

THE thesis here propounded is to be established in a second volume containing the documents which prove that the historical development of the trinity is as pictured in volume I. It would have been more satisfactory if the proof had preceded the picture, but we have to be satisfied for the present with such material as the author incidentally supplies. The picture is a sort of religious "movie". First the Father appears as the Moon-god; then the Son appears as the star Venus, only to be transformed into the Sun, in which form he eclipses the Father. At the same time the Mother comes into view as the Sun, only to reappear as Venus and gradually to fade out as the Holy Spirit. The primitive Semitic religion was trinitarian. Nomads worship the star Venus, but when nomads become agriculturists they revere the sun and pay less attention to the star and the moon; hence the Babylonian son-god becomes the sun. All Semitic scholars (except the author) are quite beside the mark in supposing that different Semitic tribes had different gods originally. They all had one god, or rather one trinity, but they called the chief god by different names and he gradually became identified with the tribe's national guardian as a political power; so Yahveh became differentiated from Chemosh and other tribal gods, though they were all originally the same Moon-god and Father-god. The Hebrews really were trinitarians, though it escaped their notice as they concentrated on the Father. Similarly, when Ishtar and Tammuz appear to be sufficient for their worshippers (as in the modernized Aphrodite and Adonis form), we must assume that the Father has somehow been forgotten and that Mother and Son presuppose the earlier perfect trinity, as anyway a son presupposes a father. Another serious mistake of other Semitic scholars is in not recognizing the identity of all the Babylonian gods, whether called Shamash, Marduk, Ninib, Nebo, or what not. A Semitic scholarship which fails to recognize that the *ur-religion* was trinitarian and that a Semitic god is always the Son of the trinity, whether called Nebo or simply Bel or Melek, is bound to go wrong. It is, to be sure, a little difficult to see why sun and Venus-star interchange, but this can easily be explained grammatically. Sun is feminine and Venus is masculine, as is moon,

among the southern Semites. In the North (Babylon) sun and Venus exchange rôles as the sun becomes masculine and Venus becomes feminine (this Babylonian view is a later form). St. Paul's Holy Spirit is the Kyrios or divine Son (and sun) transferred to Jesus, although the mother-goddess was the sun (not the earth) and the Holy Spirit really represents the divine Mother; but Mary's Virgin Birth links her also with Ishtar. The dove remains to remind us of the past, as Moses's horns remind us that Yahveh was once the moon.

The reviewer has been much interested in following the author's thesis as developed in this volume, though it has its weak points. Even the next volume, whatever its "reichliches Material", will, he feels sure, not convince the reviewer that the primitive Semitic religion was trinitarian and that all tribal gods were degenerate forms of one Father-god; but the argument as to the Kyrios has much in its favor.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Hellenic History. By GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xi, 520. \$4.00.)

PROFESSOR BOTSFORD died suddenly in 1917. Among his papers was found the manuscript of his *Hellenic History*, the publication of which had already been announced. After an interval of five years, which is nowhere alluded to in the book, the obstacles have been overcome and the work is finally in our hands. Let us say at once and for all that it deserves a cordial welcome from college teachers of Greek history. The author's son, Mr. Jay Barrett Botsford of Brown University, appears as its editor and he acknowledges the assistance of several of his father's pupils and friends in the preparation for publication of the bibliographical and illustrative material.

It would be unfair to say that had the author lived to see his history through the press he would have been forced by the discoveries and investigations of the past five years to recast radically his text. Professor Botsford's conclusions on the main problems of his period had been reached deliberately and on the basis of a personal sifting of the evidence; so that they could hardly have been upset by the scientific yield of these lean years. That consideration, however, leaves untouched the fact that those responsible, whoever they may be, have put the author in a disadvantageous position by concealing the long interval that separates the completion of the manuscript and the publication of the book; for Professor Botsford was one of those meticulous scholars who make it their practice to take account in detail of every latest contribution. Such lack of candor is also an injustice to the public. And while we are on this subject of editorial responsibility, it behooves us to add that the proof-reading, especially of the foot-notes and bibliographical notes, is extremely careless, and that there is much to support the inference that this part of the manuscript was not properly made ready for the printer. There

is no possible excuse for what is found here from chapter V. on French, German, and Greek names; and titles are mutilated, at times beyond all possible recognition.

In the field of ancient history, text-book making is an American specialty. Professor Botsford's *Hellenic History* is inevitably a text-book, but for colleges; and it is more than that: it is an independent synthesis of Greek history as a whole. In this respect it is, we believe, unique in the American literature of the subject, and invites comparison with the contemporary European histories of Greece. Thus considered it speedily appears to approximate the text-book more closely than the general histories that have appeared recently in England and Germany, and this not simply in section-headings and such matters, but also in scope and design. For while they, like the *Hellenic History* and the "new history" of Columbia fame, take cognizance of cultural achievement in general and the phenomena of literature, art, and philosophy, they leave to specialists in these subjects the analysis of masterpieces, as works of art and science, on the formal or technical side, and never forget that political history is their main theme. We have read indulgently, and with a certain admiration for the author's zeal and learning, the many chapters of Professor Botsford's book devoted to these topics; yet we have concluded that we would rather read and advise others to read, on Greek art, literature, and philosophy, accessible works of comparable compass by Gardner, Jebb, Murray, and Burnet. The competition of the historian with craftsmen of such distinction, in their own specialties, is altogether too one-sided.

Probably Professor Botsford would have denied that political history was his main theme. This seems to us a pity; for its consequences are that he is cramped in its treatment. Yet it is in the use he makes, for the understanding of states and their operations, of the sources which disclose to us events and institutions that Professor Botsford does his best work. Here the pros and cons are balanced with a judgment that is as fair as his knowledge is adequate. Repeatedly our attention is arrested by a simple statement in which a new fact or point of view is unostentatiously presented. Naturally we do not agree in every instance, but we are at least challenged to defend our divergent opinions.

One fundamental in which the reviewer systematically dissents is in the value the author attaches to the historical part of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*. In Professor Botsford's narrative, on the authority of this once much overrated work, Draco gets credit for a constitution, Clisthenes for ostracism, Aristides for radical democracy, and the Four Hundred for constitutionality. Here in each case we think that Aristotle was misled and that the variant report deserves the preference. On the other hand the reviewer finds illuminating the general view that Minoan sectionalism underlies some of the more notable differences in Middle-Age Greek institutions, since this is but a corollary to the observa-

Holleaux: Rome, la Grèce, Monarchies Hellénistiques 81

tion that the area of Greece in which the *polis* develops is precisely the area of Mycenaean culture.

But this is not the place in which to record the particulars in which the reviewer and the author agree and disagree. To report the outstanding characteristic of the book will be more apposite: it is that the work as a whole is descriptive rather than interpretative in character—that it belongs with the histories of Busolt and Niese rather than with those of Beloch and Meyer. The author's handiwork is found primarily in the selecting and expressing and massing of the facts. He has no perceptible body of general ideas in the light of which he makes Greece intelligible to his readers. This is pardonable, if not positively virtuous, in a text-book, where the teacher can add *viva voce* the necessary contacts and contrasts with contemporary or other known epochs. It detracts terribly from the interest and significance of the work for the general reader. Will its detachment from the ephemeral spirit of its age—its seeming timelessness—bring compensation in the long run? Would Thucydides even have lived without the speeches?

W. S. FERGUSON.

Rome, la Grèce, et les Monarchies Hellénistiques au III^e Siècle avant J.-C. (273-205). [Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fascicule 124.] Par MAURICE HOLLEAUX. (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1921. Pp. iv, 386. 40 fr.)

THE author of this book has been long known in scientific circles in two different capacities—as director of the French School in Athens during its second great campaign at Delos, and as a student of Greek history especially of the Macedonian period. In the latter capacity M. Holleaux has distinguished himself by combining two qualities rarely associated, German thoroughness and attention to detail and French lucidity and grace of style. The book is true to form. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise, since it contains, now set in a larger structure, several of the author's earlier studies. The larger structure is, however, the essential novelty of the book.

The task M. Holleaux has set himself is to examine the alleged contacts of Rome and the Hellenistic states prior to 215 B. C. in the light that is thrown back upon them by his searching analysis of the circumstances in which Rome intervened in the East between 212 and 200 B. C. This analysis yields for him two convictions: (1) that the Roman account of Rome's relations with the Greeks is utterly unreliable when it either deviates from or supplements Polybius; and (2) that Rome did not possess at the time of the First and Second Macedonian wars old-established "friendships" (*amicitiae*) with Eastern cities and kingdoms, and that her whole course of action after the establishment of her protectorate over Illyricum in 229 B. C. precludes the idea that even then she had any conscious interest or policy in Hellenic affairs. M. Holleaux, accordingly,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—6.

rejects the "friendship" entered into between Rhodes and Rome in 306 B. C. as due to a palpable corruption of the text of Polybius; he reduces the "amity" contracted between Ptolemy Philadelphus and Rome in 273 B. C. to a unilateral courtesy of small and ephemeral significance; he treats as unhistorical the alleged interventions of Rome on behalf of Acarnania and Ilium in 239-237 B. C.; and finds that Rome first crossed the Adriatic diplomatically and militarily at the same moment in 229 B. C., when regard for Italy led her to secure in Corcyra, Epidamnus, and Apollonia the jumping-off places for a Macedonian invader. On M. Holleaux's construction this was a mortal affront to Macedon, which consequently had thereafter the fixed purpose of throwing Rome back beyond the Strait of Otranto at the earliest opportunity. Hence it is all the more curious, on the current interpretation of Rome's progress in the East, that Rome did not try immediately thereafter, or in 219 B. C., to play the rôle in Hellas so successfully played earlier in the century by the Ptolemies, and enter at once into diplomatic relations with Macedon's enemies in Greece. Instead, even after 215 B. C., she disinterested herself in Hellenic affairs the moment Macedon concluded peace with her (205 B. C.), and only adopted the historic policy of "liberating Greek cities" when Antiochus III. hove in sight, with all the much overrated might of Asia behind him, and concluded an alliance with Philip V. for the prosecution of what the senate thought must prove anti-Roman designs (202-201 B. C.). Fear of Antiochus the Great and of monarchical machinations in general, not "friendship" for Ptolemy and Athens, led the senate to embark in 200 B. C. on the career which eventuated in first the hegemony and then the empire of Rome over the Greeks.

M. Holleaux's book is accordingly an elaborate and (let us add) very powerful attack on a general point of view which is represented in France by M. Colin's *Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 avant Jésus-Christ*, a point of view taken for example by Mommsen, Droysen, and Eduard Meyer, that a network of diplomatic negotiations bound Rome and the Hellenistic states together in one political whole and that the loss of the historical writings of the third century B. C. alone creates for us a seemingly impassable chasm between West and East from the time of Pyrrhus to that of Philip V. That these negotiations are not merely not reported but were really non-existent, M. Holleaux tries to show in particular by the ignorance of them revealed in several places by Polybius, both in what he says himself apropos of the events of Philip's time and in what he lets others say and the Romans do. We are thus invited to substitute for the old view of a crafty, designing senate laying long in advance the plans for its eventual domination over Greece the new view of a senate that not only had no commercial interests to support beyond the Adriatic, as Professor Frank contends, but also had its political vision limited to purely Italian affairs and considered the things that were happening far off in the East, when it knew of them at all, as quite devoid of any political interest for Rome.

On the whole M. Holleaux's case seems to us well established. It is not alone in prehistoric times that we have been inferring too readily the existence of political and commercial areas from the existence of cultural areas. Distance is an historic factor that needs to be appraised anew for each successive generation.

W. S. FERGUSON.

A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B. C.: a Study in Economic History. By MICHAEL ROSTOVITZ, Professor of History. [University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, VI.] (Madison: the University. 1922. Pp. xi, 209. \$2.00.)

In 1915 an important group of Greek papyri was discovered at the village of Kharabet el Gerza in the Fayum in Egypt, taken from the correspondence files of a Greek named Zenon. These have gradually been coming into the hands of the editors of papyri in the Cairo museum and in other museums and libraries in Europe and England. One of the letters was recently obtained by Professor Francis W. Kelsey for the important collection which he has built up at the University of Michigan. Already some three hundred and fifty letters from the files of Zenon have been read and published by competent papyrologists and many others are soon to appear. Over a hundred more are known to be still in the hands of the dealers in papyri. The entire correspondence centres about a single man, this Greek from Caria named Zenon, who was an important secondary figure in Ptolemaic Egypt in the middle of the third century B. C. The unusual importance of the "Zenon papyri" lies in the fact that the third century before Christ was the great constructive period of the Ptolemaic régime and that our previous knowledge of the internal activities and methods of the able Ptolemies of just that century had not been clarified because of the lack of available information.

With full knowledge of the probability that the evidence of the unpublished materials of the Zenon group might well change many details of his work, Professor Rostovtzeff of the University of Wisconsin has attempted a reconstruction of the activities of Zenon as displayed in the letters and other documents already available, in a study which he calls *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B. C.* The result is a most interesting and most valuable addition to our knowledge of the economic life of that important country and period, happily of the wider scope indicated in the subtitle of the book, "A Study in Economic History".

Zenon appears in full light in the year 258 B. C. as a personal agent in the impressive court of the finance minister of Egypt, one Apollonius. This was the time in which the great engineering project of Ptolemy Philadelphus for reclamation of land in the Fayum was in full swing. In 256 B. C. Zenon had become the chief economic manager of the

affairs of Apollonius. In particular he became director of some 6500 acres of land which Apollonius had received in "gift" from King Philadelphus. Zenon was occupied with the many tasks entailed by the establishment of the irrigation system in this large area and the direction of its agricultural production, along with the numerous industrial activities which were carried on within such an estate. With the death of King Philadelphus in 247 B. C., the great finance minister Apollonius disappeared. But the letters of Zenon do not cease. Rostovtzeff conjectures that Apollonius died in the same year as Philadelphus and that his "gift estate" then reverted to the new king. Zenon, however, remained at Philadelphus in the Fayum where the "gift estate" lay, enjoying as a private capitalist the profits accumulated in his ten years' service as agent of the great Apollonius.

This is merely the setting for the more important constructive ability which Rostovtzeff has shown in the chapter which discusses the general character of the "gift estates" of the early Ptolemies in their larger economic and political bearing; in the separate chapters explaining how the estate at Philadelphia was prepared for cultivation, what grains were sown, the important place of vine-growing, orchards, and market-gardening upon this particular estate; and in the one chapter in which Rostovtzeff's observations as to the stock-breeding, industry, commerce, and transportation on the Philadelphia estate are assembled. There are five appendixes containing other important by-products of the study of the Zenon papyri. Fundamentally the work is a study in agricultural history more than anything else. By this study Professor Rostovtzeff will have added greatly to the high distinction which his previous work has gained for him among historical workmen. The total result of the book is to confirm with a multitude of details his belief in the tremendous importance of the Greek talent for economic and political organization as displayed in the Hellenistic period. One may or may not care for "efficiency", but the Greeks had the gift of "efficiency"—along with other and greater qualities. To these greater qualities Greek "efficiency" did service.

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN.

La Ruine de la Civilisation Antique. By GUGLIELMO FERRERO.
(Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1921. Pp. 253. 5 fr.)

It will not be safe to neglect this new book of Ferrero's on the theory that one can hazard a safe guess at what the author of *Grandezza e Decadenza* will say. There is here the same dramatic art as of old, the same fondness for crises and cataclysms, the same proneness to substitute *ergo* for *post hoc*, and the same desire to make history didactic, but the doctrine of economic determinism has vanished and the influence of Lombroso can be scented only in a rare cliché here and there.

The first few chapters tell very effectively, if partially, the story of a century from the reign of Septimius Severus to the death of Constantine.

The outstanding points in the narrative are these. The world of 200 A. D. is pictured as highly prosperous. Agriculture, industry, and commerce are flourishing, schools multiply, the arts are in high favor, literature and philosophy are pursued with zeal. But Septimius Severus, in debasing the senate which Rome held to be the source of imperial authority and in adopting the principles of an absolute monarchy, destroyed men's faith in and loyalty to constituted authority. Hence the half-century of anarchy resulted.

Diocletian, a man of great genius, succeeded to some extent in restoring faith in authority again by basing his power on the theory of Oriental absolutism, which recognized the ruler as a divinity. Complete success, however, was no longer possible because the Christians, who were already very strong, refused to recognize the divinity of the ruler. Constantine, his successor, had therefore to compromise with the Christians and surrender the real logical basis of absolutism. The hereditary monarchy which he established (without the aid of the theory of "divine rights"), though adequate for the East, where monarchical principles were traditional, did not have sufficient hold on the imagination of the people of the more republican West. Hence loyalty failed the government again, and a period of anarchy ensued in which the barbarians overran the Western world. Such in brief is the story according to Ferrero.

The style is effective, and the history is free from grave errors so far as it goes. The basic materials for the theoretical part can be found in Eduard Meyer's recent books and in Schulz's *Vom Principat zum Dominat*. What is not so satisfactory is the placing of the emphasis, the slurring of discordant facts, and the perspective. It would be hard to prove by chapter and verse that the senate's authority had counted for so much in the public estimation before 235 A. D. as Ferrero makes out, that the world was then so prosperous, that Diocletian's use of the imperial cult was so very revolutionary, and that Christian democracy so far obstructed the formation of a politically effective autocracy. One looks in vain for an adequate estimate of economic, racial, and social causes of decay that were at work long before the period when Ferrero begins his story. In fact one feels inclined to believe that the author has condensed many acts of a long drama into one and eliminated many of the rôles in order to make the play carry across the footlights. And when the reader reaches the last chapter, *Au Troisième et au Vingtième Siècle*, he wonders whether the tragedy has been only a problem-play after all. He suddenly discovers that it is a case of *De te fabula*. It is well enough to remind delegates sent to our world conferences that there is danger in destroying traditional forms of government in Eastern and Central Europe, and in imposing forms, however liberal, that are neither comprehended nor respected, and that a perilous disrespect for authority and consequent anarchy may result. But it is doubtful whether it was worth

while to distort a century of innocent Roman history in order to acquire a text for this sermon, especially when the "modern democracies" employed in the parallel so badly fit the purpose that Ferrero must leave both England and America almost entirely out of the reckoning. There is after all some virtue in Ranke's dictum of how history should be written.

An English translation of the book entitled *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity* has recently come from the press of G. P. Putnam's Sons. The version, done by the Hon. Lady Whitehead, is by no means literal, but it transfers the contents into idiomatic English without serious leakage.

TENNEY FRANK.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilisation: a Series of Lectures delivered at King's College, University of London. Edited by F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Mediaeval History in the University of London, with a Preface by ERNEST BARKER, M.A., Principal of King's College. (London: George G. Harrap and Company. 1921. Pp. 268. 10s. 6d.)

HERE are ten lectures delivered in the autumn term of 1920 as part of the general scheme of public lectures at King's College (p. 7)—seven by members of its staff and three by colleagues from other colleges of the university. All show power and learning and their work indicates that the university has solid ground for pride and hope in its new Institute of Historical Research (p. 8).

Professor Hearnshaw leads off with a well-packed but clear sketch of medieval development. He walks confidently, at times over very difficult country, and raises many questions which his fellow lecturers are too optimistically expected to answer (pp. 16-17). The Rev. Claude Jenkins follows with "The Religious Contribution of the Middle Ages". He covers, with generous use of allusion and intricate pattern, many topics which are ecclesiastical rather than religious, but his handling of the necessity of the union of politics and religion (p. 64), of St. Francis's stress on duties rather than rights (p. 65), of the demand for a rational theology (p. 70), and of our debt to medieval sacramentaries and hymns (pp. 76 ff.) is excellent. Professor H. Wildon Carr in his stiff lecture on "Philosophy" essays to demonstrate, not without an occasional resort to dialectic, that the Bergsonian concept of reality as activity (which the lecturer accepts) is a synthesis of the Greek and medieval concepts. The latter "is the concept of the whole course of universal human history . . . as the real work itself which God is in process of accomplishing" (p. 96). Dr. Charles Singer's lecture on "Science" is an outstanding piece of work, and his definition of science as "*the process which makes knowledge*" (p. 108) is most serviceable. "*The Middle Ages begin for*

science at that period when the ancients ceased to make knowledge" (p. 109).

The Rev. Percy Deamer talks on "Art" in a racy fashion. "For the Church is not the clergy, nor is it bishops and popes: it is the people" (p. 158). "But you will not make art again secure and inevitable . . . until you set men's paths about with beauty again; and this involves . . . architecture . . . and costume . . ." (p. 159). Professor Israel Gollancz's discussion of "The Middle Ages in the Lineage of English Poetry" is a charming, a model, public lecture. In brief he argues for the importance of the West Midland school, represented in the fourteenth century by Langland, as a vital factor in the great Elizabethan synthesis. "As Taine well put it, the Renaissance in England was the renaissance of the Saxon genius" (p. 185). In his lecture on "Education" Professor J. W. Adamson sketches medieval curricula and organization in a workmanlike manner. It would have been of interest to bring out explicitly Vittorino's combination of the humanistic and the chivalric types of education (p. 209). Miss Hilda Johnstone, not unnaturally, has a good deal to say about women in her lecture on "Society", which deals with the medieval roots of the modern social order. She takes her prioress too literally, I fancy. The prioress sent her convent chaplain to represent her at a diocesan assembly "since it is not fitting that women should mix themselves up with men's meetings" (p. 223). Surely the prioress must have smiled as she wrote those words. Mr. E. R. Adair's discussion of "Economics" is straightforward and sound, and gives due attention to gild socialism. William Morris gets rather too much praise, however, if Arthur Pound's *Iron Man* is to dominate industry. Our gradual return to the Just Price (p. 247) should, I think, be explained by the opportunity which improved transportation affords to monopoly. Professor J. W. Allen's exposition of "Politics" opens overmodestly. It is a clean-cut treatment of medieval political thought and its importance.

What are the defects of these excellent lectures, apart from those necessarily connected with such a co-operative undertaking and aside from the inevitable omission of lectures on many subjects, as music and canon law, which you or I would like to have treated? To one reader the inadequate indication of what H. O. Taylor calls the "spotted actuality" is a defect. The worldliness of our ancestors is not brought out. A free use of vernacular literature alone would have served to mitigate this defect. A second is the omission of an index. How much longer is it going to take our British historical colleagues to discover the necessity—and urbanity—of an index? Such a key would be helpful even to the lecturers themselves, for it would remind them that specialists should be cautious in dropping *obiter dicta* on topics outside their own fields, and especially so when such dicta seem to be drawn from the common fields of the traditional handbooks. An index would have

brought this warning home to all—and all of us need it. One example must serve. On Revival of Learning and Renaissance, see pp. 15, 36-37, 39, 112, 113, 149, 150, 163-165, 182, 185, 194, 205. The dogmatic flavor of the book, taken as a whole, is probably the by-product of unavoidable brevity. The reviewer offers the same plea for his review.

G. C. SELLERY.

Histoire de la Nation Française. Par GABRIEL HANOTAUX, de l'Académie Française. Tome VI. *Histoire Religieuse.* Par GEORGES GOYAU. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1922. Pp. 639. 48 fr.)

If the principles of eugenics are valid for life, why not also for letters? If a child may be "well-born", why not also a book? However that may be, and whatever the theoretical limits of scientific mating and breeding, the volume that lies before us is the offspring of a perfect union of author and subject. To write the religious history of France no happier choice could have been made than the scholar whose profound and comprehensive studies, extending over more than a quarter of a century, have established his pre-eminence in his special field. And to this scholar could have been assigned no more congenial task than to trace for his fellow-countrymen the long course of their religious life. One can well believe that it were no task, but a labor of love, a kind of votive offering, the spontaneous outpouring of a feeling in which the religious and the patriotic are perfectly blended.

For to M. Goyau religion and patriotism are one and inseparable—for the reason that the genius of France expresses itself, and has always expressed itself, in a passion for the universal. "Chez les Druides qui pressentent et préparent, et chez Irénée qui révèle; chez Calvin qui 'proteste', et chez Comte qui nie, même souci de l'universel. N'est-ce pas un des traits les plus frappants du génie religieux de la France?" (p. 619). France must be religious, for in religion alone does the idea of the universal find adequate expression. And France must be Catholic, for Catholicism alone embodies the universal in religion. "Si haut que nous remontions dans notre histoire, une affinité s'entrevoit entre nos âmes et l'idée d'une religion universelle" (p. 617). From the days of St. Remi and Boniface to the days of Chateaubriand and de Maistre, all roads have led to Rome. No false guides have been able permanently to seduce France from that path. Even her occasional lapses into Gallicanism are due to passing irritation, rather than to design; at bottom, they are manifestations of the same ineradicable instinct for unity and universality that made and kept France Catholic. Charles the Great might make a "Gallican gesture", but he was no Gallican, or, if so, unwittingly and unintentionally (pp. 125, 136); Hincmar might stand for the rights of the metropolitan, but as over against the bishops, rather than as against the pope (p. 150); St. Louis might arraign the

clergy, but before the tribunal of conscience, not before the throne (p. 269); the bishops might support Philip IV. against Boniface VIII., but from motives prudential, not upon grounds dogmatic (pp. 274-275); the efforts of d'Ailly and Gerson were bent toward unity, not toward independence (pp. 298-303); Richelieu's concern was quite as much for the integrity of the Church, as for the supremacy of the crown (p. 400); even the Declaration of 1682 is to be understood as a theological formula, more or less felicitous, expressing the need for assurance of the independence of the monarchy (p. 446). "Royal Gallicanism", "Parliamentary Gallicanism", upon occasion, yes; but of "conscious, defined, ecclesiastical Gallicanism", scarcely a trace. Susceptible when the national autonomy is threatened; susceptible also when the religious unity is put in jeopardy; troubled when these two susceptibilities are at variance; contented when they are in harmony—such is the innate disposition of France (p. 618). For one vertiginous instant France did find herself schismatic (p. 449); but even then the heart of France was Catholic, as the Concordat proved (pp. 535, 618). In the face of heretic, reformer, Parliamentarian, Revolutionist, even Separatist, France has steadfastly held her way and maintained her vital touch with Rome.

But it is not only as the "fille aînée de l'Église" that M. Goyau would have us see France, but also as the "ouvrière de Dieu", fulfilling her "vocation religieuse", through monk and missionary and crusader, by theologian and teacher and master-builder. And what a splendid panorama he unfolds! Cluny, Chartreuse, Prémontré, Prouille, Montmartre—what mighty forces have these cradled and sent forth! What lines have gone forth to the ends of the world, from Paris and St. Victor and Clairvaux! What does not Catholic theology and worship owe to France!—the doctrines of transubstantiation and the Immaculate Conception, the Ave Maria and the elevation of the host, the cult of the Virgin (pp. 216-217)? As for the debt of Christian art, let Reims stand for the whole.

And in this apostolate, hand in hand with the Church has marched the State. "L'alliance entre la France politique et la France missionnaire . . . survit à toutes les vicissitudes politiques" (p. 620). What! even the rupture of 1905? Yes, even that, predicts M. Goyau: "On sentira renaître, entre la France officielle et l'Église, l'esprit de concorde et de collaboration morale" (p. 602).

It is a splendid and majestic pageant that M. Goyau has produced, a work of consummate artistry. But, if one may venture to criticize a masterpiece, as a *history*, it suffers from a too limited interpretation of its scope—it is too exclusively "religious". For though religion may be regarded as a phase of life, it is in fact an integral part of life, influencing, and reciprocally influenced by, all the other vital elements and forces. And religious history cannot be adequately written by sifting out the "religious" and ignoring the rest. Least of all can this be done in the case of France where, as M. Goyau himself insists, religion is of

the very fibre of the national life. And yet this is the method that M. Goyau has pursued, quite rigorously confining himself to the "religious", in the restricted sense of the word, and relegating the political, the economic, the social, to his collaborators. This is perfectly legitimate in view of the prearranged division of labor; but the result is none the less unfortunate. If religion embodies itself in a church, and if, as in France, the Church has been immemorially bound up with the State, how can one justly interpret the religious without recourse to the political? How partial and inadequate must be an exclusively "religious" exposition of, say, the Cluniac movement, or *Unam Sanctam*, or the Councils, or the Reformation and Religious Wars, or the Restoration and Ultramontaniam—to cite but some of the most conspicuous instances of M. Goyau's rather scant regard for the political determinants in religious developments. When this process is applied to historical portraiture, the result is nothing less than distortion. Imagine the face of Richelieu with all the political wrinkles smoothed out! or Joan of Arc with an aureole but no oriflamme, a conventional saint whose title to immortality rests, not upon having beaten back the English, but upon having saved the Faith! (pp. 313, 399 ff.). Rather unfamiliar likenesses, these.

But as for the portrait of France herself, *la France Religieuse*—well, an artist can but paint as he sees. M. Goyau has seen with an eye of love and reverence, and has limned the features of his *douce France* with devotion and sincerity. The figure on his canvas is one of great dignity and strength, with a face of mature and serene beauty.

THEODORE COLLIER.

Arabic Thought and its Place in History. By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D., Lecturer in Aramaic and Syriac, Bristol University. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, and Company; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1922. Pp. viii, 320. 10s. 6d.)

MR. O'LEARY seeks to accomplish three main things: in the first place, to describe the transmission of Hellenistic thought by Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew-speaking authors; secondly, to note any developments which it may have received from these; and thirdly, to state the influence which it exercised on Muslim and Christian theology and mysticism. By Hellenistic thought is meant chiefly the logic, physics, and metaphysics of Aristotle, his psychology as interpreted by Alexander of Aphrodisias and the Neo-Platonists, the Plotinian system of philosophy especially as it appears in the so-called "Theology of Aristotle", and the medical writings of Galen, Dioscorus, and the Alexandrian school.

The author's treatment of this rather vast subject is very clear and his method of exposition is to be commended. His knowledge of it, if not always strictly accurate, is, on the whole, well balanced, and Mr.

O'Leary has the saving grace of always giving his sources and naming the available texts of these sources, which is one of the most valuable features of the book. His method is to take certain well-defined periods and to discuss the translations from Greek literature which were made in these periods, together with the commentaries on these that appeared, as also any independent works then produced which have the mark of being influenced by the above-mentioned body of thought.

The Syriac period is for Mr. O'Leary one of translation and commentary predominantly, and its principal activity is with Aristotle's logic. Here the author rather neglects the field of Syriac mysticism with its Platonic and Neo-Platonic tendencies and the probable effect which it had not only on Sūfism but on Muslim theology as well.

The Arabic period has five main divisions: namely, the Translators, the Eastern Philosophers, Sūfism, Orthodox Scholasticism, and Western Philosophy. The main feature of this period Mr. O'Leary finds in the developments produced by the Muslim philosophers in questions of metaphysics and psychology, especially the latter. The earliest types of Muslim thought, the theological positions of the Mu'tazilites, for example, are discussed, the systems of al-Allaf, an-Nazzam, as-Sulami, al-Jahir, and a few others being outlined briefly; and these are found to be dependent for their material on the Syriac scholars. The period of active translation under al-Ma'mun is described and the various translators and their works given. On this basis arises Muslim philosophy, and the author, distinguishing two periods of development, the earlier Eastern and the later Western (Spanish), sketches succinctly the systems of such exponents of it as al-Farabī and ibn Sina in the East and ibn Bajja and ibn Rushd in the West. The influence of this philosophy on Muslim theology is then shown by epitomizing the doctrines of the chief Muslim theologians from al-Ash'ari to al-Ghazali. The medical writings of ibn Sina and ibn Rushd are noted, and many other aspects of Muslim life, such as Sūfism, the Shi'a with its various sects, "the brotherhood of purity", etc., are touched upon and their relations to Hellenistic thought brought out. Two chapters at the end, then, discuss such Jewish transmitters of this Muslim form of Hellenistic thought to the Latin schoolmen as ibn Gabirul or Maimonides, and the influence of this Muslim thought on the schoolmen.

Mr. O'Leary's treatment of his subject, so far as sects and schools and representatives of both these go, is practically exhaustive. It is also clear and definite. It lacks, however, at times, precision. To compare the function of the soul in Neo-Platonism with that of the "common-sense" of Aristotle, for example, as he does on page 21, means nothing. Scholars still debate what Aristotle meant by his "common-sense". The same criticism applies to his analogy between al-Farabi's *'aql hayyulani* and Aristotle's "common-sense" (p. 148). And to say that the Meccans' opposition to Muhammed was based on tribal jealousy is any-

thing but the fact (p. 56). Nevertheless the subject by his treatment of it gains perspective. That is much.

A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West. By Sir R. W. CARLYLE, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., and A. J. CARLYLE, M.A., D.Litt., Lecturer in Politics and Economics, University College, Oxford. Volume IV. *The Theories of the Relation of the Empire and the Papacy from the Tenth Century to the Twelfth.* By A. J. CARLYLE. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1922. Pp. xxiii, 419. 30 s.)

THE first three volumes of this work have been reviewed in earlier issues of this magazine (X. 629, XV. 836, XXI. 784). Like the former volumes the fourth exhibits the qualities of painstaking reading of the sources, extreme care not to draw conclusions unwarranted by the texts, elaborate reprinting at the bottom of each page of long extracts from the Latin originals, excellent tables of contents and indexes.

This volume, however, is unlike its predecessors in that at times the reader can scarcely believe that he is reading a book on political theory. A not inappropriate title would be "a history of the simony and investiture struggle". In spite of the fact that the author in the preface warns his readers that "this work is not the history, either civil or ecclesiastical, of the Middle Ages, but the political theories", the larger part of the volume is predominantly historical. The author says: "I do not indeed think that these relations [hence those between the temporal and spiritual powers] had as much effect upon political theory in general as has been sometimes suggested", and yet goes on to say "I think that we are justified in devoting a whole volume to the conflicts of the Empire and the Papacy". In fact on p. 253 he says: "We have been compelled to do so", that is, to give a great deal of historical narrative.

Part I. is taken up with a history of the relation of the spiritual and temporal powers from 900 to 1076; part II. with a history of the investiture controversy to 1122, and the comments of various contemporary authors on that subject and simony; part III. with a history of the political conflict of the papacy and the Empire and comments of contemporary authors on the very narrow questions as to whether the pope and the emperor were co-ordinate in power, each in his own field, or one subordinate to the other, whether the pope could interfere in the election of, excommunicate, and depose the emperor, or the emperor have a part in the election of popes and bishops; part IV. with a history of the relations of the Church and the Empire from 1122 to 1177, in which the first chapter is devoted to the relations of Frederick I. (Barbarossa) to the papacy, the second to John of Salisbury, and the third to Gerhoh of Reichersberg, and their respective ideas on the questions enumerated above.

In extracting from the various writers their views on the subject of the relations of the temporal and spiritual powers the plan of the

author is to list the writers in order. The reader finds himself in perfect bewilderment from reading statements that are so nearly alike that they need no repetition. Even in the historical narrative he frequently finds the same matter repeated again and again in almost the same words (*cf.*, for example, pp. 359 and 345, and 365 with 321).

The truth seems to be that in a history of political theory the author has given a lengthy study of the relations of the emperors and popes out of all proportion to their value to political theory and this on a field which has been the subject of more investigation than almost any other field in the Middle Ages. This volume could be reduced by three-fourths and the student of political theory not be the loser thereby.

Though it is a distinct disappointment from the above points of view. the exposition of the theories in the "Tractatus Eboracenses" (pp. 279 ff.) and of those of Honorius of Augsburg (pp. 286 ff.) is particularly good. So also is the forcefulness with which the fact is brought out that purely academic theories buried away in books caused no commotion until someone tried to put them into operation (p. 336).

The inefficiency of the printing craft of to-day is probably responsible for allowing the title-page to come out with "twelfth" for "twelfth" and "septrum" for "sceptum" (p. 162), but much more inexcusable and certainly very confusing to the reader is the fault of not having discovered until the volume was through the press that "Godfrey" of Vendôme had been spelled Geoffrey throughout. Equally confusing is it to have the period covered in this volume designated from the tenth century to the twelfth when in the third volume the same period is labelled from the tenth century to the thirteenth.

JAMES SULLIVAN.

The Cambridge Medieval History. Planned by J. B. BURY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History. Edited by H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.; J. P. WHITNEY, D.D.; J. R. TANNER, Litt.D.; C. W. PREVITÉ-ORTON, M.A. Volume III. *Germany and the Western Empire.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xxxix, 700. 11 maps. 50 s.)

THE closing lines of Arnold's "Sohrab and Rustum" pressed themselves upon my memory as I approached the end of this volume.

French history flows "brimming and bright and large" from the pen of such masters as MM. René Poupardin and Louis Halphen, and the history of the break-up of Charlemagne's empire, of the later Carolingians and first Capetians (to the year 1000) is presented with clarity, fullness, and sense of proportion, as one would expect from such scholars, in seven chapters (I.-VI., XVII.). Chapter XVI., the Western Caliphate, from the pen of Dr. Rafael Altamira, is of a piece with

the chapters on France. In 31 pages we have the gist of Spanish history before the Cid. The best chapter by an English contributor is that of Mr. Mawer on the Vikings.

But when one turns to the chapters dealing with Germany, Italy, and the Western Empire—the core of the period—then the stream of history becomes indeed “a foiled circuitous wanderer”. We have the anomaly of the pivotal chapters in the volume being the worst. Eccentric determinism and unscientific analysis have here done injury to the subject. Any scholar who has worked across the field of German history in the feudal age knows that the period of the Saxon dynasty (919–1024) constitutes a logical unity as distinct as the reign of the first two Salian emperors (1024–1056). Yet in strange violation of this fundamental fact we find separate chapters distinguished by reigns. Otto II. and Otto III., small men both, are raised to equal eminence with their two great predecessors and have a whole chapter to themselves, whereas a few pages would have satisfactorily disposed of them. Similarly, Henry II., Conrad II., and Henry III. have each a special chapter.

This absurd arrangement is aggravated by the further strange fact that instead of intrusting the history of the Saxon period to one writer, and that of the Salian to another (which would have preserved both historical and literary unity), the six chapters on Germany and Italy, the largest single *bloc* in the book, have been distributed among four different authors. The heaviest burden of two chapters on the Saxon kings and one on Conrad II. has fallen upon the shoulders of Mr. Austin Lane Poole, while Mr. Edwin H. Holthouse has written upon Henry II., Miss Caroline M. Ryley upon Henry III., and Mr. C. W. Previté-Orton upon Italy in the tenth century.

The result is a boneless string of unarticulated and sometimes inconsistent information. For example, Mr. Lane Poole (p. 192) represents Lorraine as being “always firmly attached to the Carolingian tradition”, and implies that the acquisition of the duchy by Henry I. was an act of spoliation; yet on p. 197, in the reign of Otto I., we are told that “the Lorrainers . . . were, almost to a man, loyal to the king”; and further on (p. 210) it appears that in 984 the Lotharingian nobles “at once prepared to resist Lothair’s attempt to occupy the duchy”.

There is no sustained, uniform, consistent method of treatment throughout these chapters on Saxon and early Salian Germany. Italy, in the more competent hands of Mr. Previté-Orton, fares better.

Historical presentation is in keeping with this defective method. Mere narration, factual accumulation, prevails throughout. Page after page reminds one of the *Jahrbücher*. Indeed, so slavishly is this practice adhered to that one wonders how much of the literature of the subject (sources and authorities) these three contributors have read beyond the Year Books of the reigns. Except in the case of the chapter on Italy, not one of these sad chapters gives much evidence of study

of the works whose titles are so grandly arrayed in the bibliographies at the end of the volume. One example of this jejune method of presentation will suffice:

In the first days of September, accompanied by the Empress Gisela and archbishop Herman, Henry made his first visit as sole ruler to Saxony. . . .

Disquieting news reached Henry in Saxony of events in Bohemia . . . but an embassy with hostages from Bratislav . . . determined him for the time to peace. So he dismissed his forces and turned south to Bavaria

From Bavaria, at the beginning of the new year, 1040, he moved to his mother's native duchy of Swabia. . . . At Ulm he summoned his first Fürstentag. . . . From Ulm Henry passed to the Rhine. . . . Thus too closed his inaugural progress through the realm. During its course had died Henry's cousins. . . . On 13 August he broke camp for Bohemia. . . . The expedition failed . . . Henry . . . retraced his steps through Bavaria . . . and started, early in September [1042], on the Hungarian expedition. It was a success. . . . The king spent the Christmas of 1042 at Goslar. . . . Early in the following month at Goslar, the Empress-Mother died.

There are pages and pages, nearly whole chapters, of this sort of thing. One looks in vain for large view, for constructive interpretation, cogent and compact summary. There is no consecutive and sustained treatment of the really important movements of the time anywhere in these futile pages upon feudal Germany. The reader who may wish to study the history of the administrative policy of the Saxon or Salian emperors, the important secular activities of the German episcopate, Conrad II's "revindication" of the fisc, the course of the Billunger dukes of Saxony, the subject of German eastward colonization beyond the Elbe—to cite examples—will be compelled to turn many pages, be content with casual allusion or quite as often no mention at all, and finally emerge from a wilderness of words with a few scattered bits of information in his hand, like unstrung beads. The history of the border peoples of Germany during this epoch—Poland, Bohemia, Hungary—surely deserved a chapter to itself. Instead their history dribbles along through the chapters upon Germany.

The editor's explanatory statement in the preface, that "the war necessitated large changes in plan and execution" of this volume, may be held to mean that the writing of these chapters was originally intrusted to superior historical scholars in Germany, but that as a consequence of warfare recourse had to be made to British home talent.

Whether the editors or the publishers cancelled the contracts abroad which had been entered into, or whether the proposed German contributors withdrew their names on account of the war I do not know with certainty. The issue has been unfortunate. British scholarship has never distinguished itself in the field of medieval German history. Mr. Herbert Fisher's excellent *Mediaeval Empire* has no fellow. When one thinks

what these chapters on the history of a great epoch might have been if they had been written by such scholars as Hartmann, Werminghoff, Peisker, Kötzschke, Hampe, Hofmeister, Stutz, Schmeidler, *et al.*, one is divided between indignation at such flagrant editorial short-sightedness and pity for the novices who have attempted to accomplish feats beyond their knowledge or their strength. Mr. Austin Lane Poole is the author of a successful university prize essay upon Henry the Lion — *ein ziemlich luftiges Buch*. What has Mr. Holthouse or Miss Ryley written in this field? Not even an article by either is cited in the bibliography.

We have noted the omission of any chapter upon the Poles, Bohemians, and Magyars. Quite as serious, even more so, is the omission of any chapter dealing with the economic and social changes in Western Europe during an epoch which extends from the death of Charlemagne to the Crusades. It is poor defense for the editor to tell us in the introduction that "in these centuries, even more than in others, it is chiefly of kings, of battles and great events, or of purely technical things like legal grants or taxes, of which alone we can speak, because it is of them we are mostly told. We know but little of the general life of the multitude on its social and economic side. For that we must argue back from later conditions, checked by the scanty facts we have" (Intro., p. xx). This argument is specious, even untrue. The great body of literature available upon the economic and social history of Europe in these centuries belies the statement.

Sir Paul Vinogradoff's chapter upon Feudalism is what one might expect from his thorough knowledge of the institution. Yet it is certainly strange, in a volume in which all the chapters save two deal with the history of Continental Europe, that the chapter upon feudalism should particularly deal with *English* feudalism. In explanation of this curious state of things we are again informed by the editor that "what is said, therefore, as to the origins of English Feudalism also applies, with due allowance for great local differences, to Germany, France, and Italy" (Intro., p. x). How is one without information from other works to make these "due allowances"? The reviewer has spent a good many years in the study of feudalism, and is much of the opinion that the differences between French, German, and Italian feudalism are more striking than the similarities or identities, and that a knowledge of English feudalism will not help one greatly in understanding the nature of that institution upon the Continent.

"Ephraim is a cake unturned." This is a half-baked book. The chapters on the history of France and the Church are admirable. The rest of the volume, with the exceptions noted, is a sodden mass of half-cooked, half-digested material. There is not space to particularize minor defects in so large a book. But I should really like to know what evidence Miss Ryley has that Transjurane Burgundy (Franche

Comté) was really "romance" in the tenth and eleventh centuries (pp. 273, 286). Protest might be made, too, against the romantic idea that "misfortune and the Italian climate combined to ruin Otto II's health"—he died from an overdose of aloes taken to stop the dysentery. This kind of vague explanation of events is too frequent.

A word in conclusion about the bibliography. Like those in the preceding volumes of the series, this, too, shows that it has been compiled by a librarian instead of by the scholar to whose contribution it is supposed to be a supplement. The bibliographies throughout give evidence of mechanical design and mechanical execution, and an observation in the preface confirms this conviction. Some of the omissions are serious, especially in the list of books upon feudalism. Neither Guilhaume's *L'Origine de la Noblesse en France* nor Sée's *Les Classes Rurales et le Régime Domanial en France au Moyen Age* (1901) is cited for French feudalism, although they are two of the most valuable books on the subject.

After "due allowance", as the editor has urged, one yet may reasonably expect to discover such classics as Inama Sternegg's *Grossgrundherrschaften*, Nitzsch's *Ministerialität und Bürgerthum*, Below's *Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters*, and the *Schwabenspiegel*—cited as literature upon German feudalism. Gebhardt's admirable *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte* is cited in the old edition instead of in the new and enlarged edition. The general bibliography also omits such important works as Manitius, *Deutsche Geschichte unter den Sächsischen und den Salischen Kaisern* (1889), Gerdes, *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes* (1891), Franz von Löher, *Kulturgeschichte der Deutschen im Mittelalter* (1891-1892), and Kötzschke, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte*.

On map 33, Nuremberg, Hainsburg, Pressburg, Ratzeburg, Hersfeld, Wollin ought not to have been omitted. Göttingen was not in existence in Saxon-Salian times, and Zähringen unheard of.

It is fortunate that this mediocre volume is less by nearly 150 pages than its two predecessors. Yet the cost to the purchaser is greater than before!

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

The History of Conspiracy and Abuse of Legal Procedure. By PERCY HENRY WINFIELD, LL.D., Lecturer in Law at St. John's and Trinity Colleges, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1921. Pp. xxvii, 219. 20 s.)

THE effort to pervert the processes of the law to unlawful ends inevitably calls into existence other processes by way of counteraction. It is the history of this phase of legal development which forms the subject of the present volume—announced as the first of the *Cambridge Studies in English Legal History*, under the editorship of Professor

AM. HIS. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—7.

Hazeltine. Conspiracy is the first topic dealt with—for not until late in its life do we see the term “conspiracy” definitely take on a meaning broader than that of “combination to promote false accusations and suits before a Court” (p. 109)—and this topic occupies rather more than half the book. The remaining chapters survey the cognate fields of champerty and maintenance (we all remember the solicitude with which Mr. Quirk, of Quirk, Gammon, and Snap, perused these titles in Blackstone), embracery and misconduct of jurors, common barratry and frivolous arrests.

A matter for regret is the necessity, explained in the author’s preface, for separate publication of the material appearing as *The Present Law of Abuse of Legal Procedure* (Cambridge, 1921). The dichotomy thus attempted, the author tells us, could not be carried out in the last two chapters, so that these alone, in the present volume, bring the story down to date. While the two books together give us a connected view of the subject, the unitary arrangement of the second is likely to prove a little embarrassing to the reader who seeks to resume there the thread he has been following in the first.

The sureness of tread with which Dr. Winfield appears to move, in general, among the Year Books fails him somewhat when he comes to deal with questions of pleading. Thus, with reference to the writ of conspiracy for false indictment, he says (p. 90): “if the plaintiff made no mention of the indictment he would be met successfully by the plea, ‘nul tiel record’.” This is said to have been conceded *obiter* in Trin. 9 Hen. VI., f. 26. But as, under the rules of common-law pleading, it would be out of the question to deny something not alleged, so what we find conceded is in effect that when the indictment is alleged, nul tiel record is a good plea. A similar criticism applies to the statement (p. 67 n.) that “the indictor should put in the record of the indictment. Otherwise he would be met by the replication ‘nul tiel record’.” What should have been said is that where the defendant alleges the indictment in his plea and is met by a replication of nul tiel record, then he must see to the production of the record—a fairly obvious necessity. Again, the explanation on p. 138 (note to p. 137) of what the defendant had to do in pleading specially in an action of maintenance would have been more satisfactory if it had kept in view the distinction between a plea of traverse and one in confession and avoidance. Nor are we prepared to accept the author’s apparent conclusion (pp. 136, 137) that the plaintiff, in an action of maintenance, could make the case one of general maintenance or special maintenance, at will, by the generality or particularity of the allegations in his writ and declaration. That the term “special maintenance” is applied to a particularization of the charge seems clear enough, but the difficulty is that in none of the cases cited in this connection does the particularization so characterized occur in the declaration: it comes in the replication after new matter has been advanced

by the plea. Thus the plaintiff in these cases (to use the Scots term employed by the author) is "condescending on" particularity of allegation only when he is forced to it by the character of the plea.

But any shortcomings in this highly technical province count for little in the sum of the book. Its minute examination of the sources and enlightening correlation of results with contemporary social and governmental conditions fully justify the editor's remark that the volume is the outcome of "painstaking, skilful and learned research". It exhibits, too, on the part of the author a gift for picturesque phrase which he might well have used less sparingly. Legal history has few enough votaries at the best, and to one who approaches her with the earnestness of purpose and solidity of performance here displayed she owes an indebtedness which cannot be too freely acknowledged.

ROBERT W. MILLAR.

Histoire de la Coutume de la Prévôté et Vicomté de Paris. Par OLIVIER MARTIN, Professeur à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Rennes, Chargé de Cours à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris. Tome I. (Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1922. Pp. xv, 508. 30 fr.)

ALTHOUGH the great interest and importance of the customary law which prevailed throughout the greater part of France from the tenth century to the close of the Old Régime have long been recognized, and though some of the earlier customary compilations, such as the *Établissements de Saint-Louis*, have been made the subject of brilliant studies, no one until recently has attempted a comprehensive and thoroughgoing work upon any one of the important regional customs (*coutumes générales*) throughout the whole of its history. It is such a work upon the custom of the region of Paris—or more specifically, from the close of the thirteenth century, the custom of the *prévôté et vicomté de Paris*—which has been undertaken by Olivier Martin, and the first volume of which is now at hand. First honored by the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques with the Prix Odilon Barrot in 1912, this extensive monograph at that time drew warm praise from so great an authority upon the history of French law and institutions as Jacques Flach. But it has since been completely rewritten after more exhaustive researches.

The present volume is taken up with a general introduction and with two books dealing with the status of persons (*condition des personnes*) and with tenures (*régime des biens*). The second volume, which is promised without too great delay, will be devoted to "l'étude de la propriété et des droits réels, le droit des gens mariés, les successions, donations, et testaments, enfin les obligations et voies d'exécution".

Of the matter now published, the introduction, besides fully describing the sources, is devoted to what may be called the external history

of the custom of Paris as a distinctive body of law, from its origin in the feudal chaos of the tenth and eleventh centuries through all the main stages of its development to its decline in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is a condensed, though careful, treatment. Important problems are inevitably left unsolved. One looks in vain, for example, for an exact answer to the question why the local customs of the region coalesced and emerged as the *usus et consuetudines Francie circa Parisius* at the end of the twelfth, or certainly early in the thirteenth, century, before the definite constitution of the *prévôté et vicomté de Paris*, as equivalent to the *bailliage*, with fixed geographical boundaries and a court of appeals at the Châtelet. But probably an exact answer cannot be given. The dependence of the development of the custom upon the larger transformations of social and economic evolution is brought out with great skill and insight.

In the two books which follow the introduction, and which make up the bulk of the volume, the author addresses himself to the content of the custom of Paris—to the growth and transformation of the actual rules of customary law which determined the status of nobles, freemen, serfs, and minors and regulated the holding and transfer of allods, fiefs, *censives*, *champs*, etc. We have to do with a detailed treatment of a mass of law, in which the jurist somewhat overshadows the historian, and we get not so much a history of the evolution of custom as a series of expositions of the customary law in successive epochs—the Middle Ages, the sixteenth century, etc. But where so much is given it would be ungrateful to complain. This is a work of immense industry, and of interest to students in many fields.

C. W. DAVID.

The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries from the Earliest Times up to the Industrial Revolution. By HERBERT HEATON, M.A., M.Com. [Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, X.] (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1920. Pp. xii, 459. 16s.)

WITHIN self-imposed limits this is an excellent book. Written at first as a thesis on the condition of the Yorkshire woollen and worsted industries in the eighteenth century, it has been expanded to the limits indicated by the title. In the completed work the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries still claim two-thirds of the pages and these parts naturally remain most intimate and original. In them we catch glimpses of letter-books and of municipal or judicial records not accessible outside of Yorkshire, and contributing much to concreteness of description and illustration.

It might seem that an account of the woollen industry in an area where it rose early and finally became pre-eminent would serve as an epitome of its development in England as a whole. In a measure this is true. But to the end of the seventeenth century Yorkshire was only one of

three large producing areas and its stuffs remained, as they had been from the first, coarser and cheaper than those of East Anglia or of the Southwest. Its principal towns, too, except the city of York, came late into the field, and its worsted industry was a tardy expansion at the expense of East Anglia. The area described, therefore, is not quite typical either in its early history or in the character of its product, limitations of which Mr. Heaton is, of course, aware.

To the story of the earlier centuries the author has brought new information got from the alnage accounts. From them he has compiled a valuable table showing the contribution of all English counties to the 40,000 broadcloths annually made for sale at about 1470. Yorkshire's quota was then just under 5000, of which nearly one-half came from the city of York and only two-fifths from the West Riding. Even so, the output of the West Riding towns, with which the future lay, was three times as great as it had been in 1397. During the fifteenth century, therefore, there began in them and especially in Halifax a development of the domestic system which replaced the craft arrangements characteristic of the fourteenth century and of the city of York. From this conclusion of Mr. Heaton's, true as it is for Yorkshire, we may not generalize; for he has not got from the alnage accounts all that they reveal. Indeed, his total of 40,000 broadcloths would be reduced somewhat had he worked out the three-year average which, he admits, is desirable but which he thinks unattainable; and he should have noted that the years around 1470 were presumably years of depression. In particular he has not attempted to get the output for all of England at the end of the fourteenth century, as he has done for Yorkshire, nor in the middle of that century, for which time he misses the accounts altogether. An examination of these documents would have shown him that Yorkshire was laggard both in her general industrial development and in her breaking away from the craft system. Nor does his account of the Merchant Adventurers, the conveyers of English cloths to foreign markets, add much to our knowledge. He even fails in text and bibliography to refer to Schulze's account of the rivalry of English and Hanseatic merchants for the Baltic trade, a tale which reveals pretty clearly the ultimate mart for thousands of English woollens.

From the sixteenth century, however, the narrative is adequate. Mr. Heaton contends that most Yorkshire clothiers were humble men, each producing little more than one kersey a week, and that the predominance of such in contrast with larger producers is the only difference between the domestic industry of Yorkshire and that of the Southwest. He describes the frauds of the trade, especially the excessive stretching of cloth, the activity of the state in restraining these abuses and in regulating wages, the tenacious and successful conflict of the clothier with the alnager intent on a higher tax upon kerseys,

the depression of the early seventeenth century due to pestilence and war, and the concurrent struggle to maintain foreign markets threatened by the mercantilist ideals of Holland and France. With the eighteenth century he brings us to the "period of progress". Between 1740 and 1800 the broadcloths produced in Yorkshire increased from 41,441 to 285,851 and the narrow cloths from 58,620 to 169,262—all this before more than twenty factories had appeared in the county. Some of the causes ascribed are of a general character—trade with a newly established colonial empire and improvements in national finance and communication—but particularly explicable of Yorkshire's advance was its supply of water-power, now fully utilized. The phenomenon of an eighteenth-century development, practically independent of the impetus given by new machinery and the factory system, suggests that forces were then at work in England which cannot be described in a narrow formula. For a scholarly exposition of this development, illustrated with vivid details of the conditions of manufacture and marketing, we owe Mr. Heaton much.

H. L. GRAY.

Tudor Constitutional Documents, A. D. 1485-1603. With an Historical Commentary. By J. R. TANNER, Litt.D., Fellow and formerly Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1922. Pp. xxii, 636. 37 s. 6 d.)

THIS beautifully made volume does for the whole Tudor period in a more complete way what Prothero does for the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. in his *Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents*. Salient statutes, parliamentary debates, cases, reports of treason trials, extracts from pamphlets, essays, and letters are marshalled to illustrate the foundations of the Tudor monarchy, the church settlements of Henry VIII. and his children, the functions of the king's secretary, and of the Council, the constitution and jurisdiction of the various courts, the law of treason, the organization and working of local government, the place of Parliament in the state, and finance.

The extracts are carefully chosen, and little of importance in the printed sources has been omitted, except perhaps Dudley's *Trce of Commonwealth*, a rare and important commentary on Henry VII.'s system. The most valuable and original section is that on local government; the most serious omission is the failure to discuss in a compact chapter the Tudor theory of sovereignty, although of course that is developed from place to place all through the book. The section on the church settlements, covering 189 out of 626 pages of text, is disproportionately long. In the discussion of the monasteries the attempt is again made to discover whether or not the monks were really evil in their living, without a suggestion of the real question whether the monastic establishments were any longer fulfilling any social or economic

function which warranted their continuing to receive large amounts of the national income. The social phase of the church movement as an expression of developed nationalism which ended in substituting patriotism for Christianity is unrecognized; its material aspect, with the importance of the church lands in every variation of policy to the final solution of saving one's soul and safeguarding one's newly acquired estates, is never hinted at.

Unfortunately for the larger usefulness of his book, Dr. Tanner has made his selections exclusively from material already printed; and indeed, for certain parts of his field he seems to be unaware of the great stores of original manuscript documents to be found in the Record Office and British Museum manuscript room. Otherwise, he would never have written, "there is a remarkable deficiency of the original material of history" for the reign of Henry VII. The failure to use these rich mines results in a disproportionate slimness of the section on the foundations of the Tudor monarchy. A few pages from the Burghley correspondence would have vastly enriched the selections on the king's secretary and the Council, and raised a question whether after all "the Tudor Council is the King's slave".

In the discussion of finance there are some errors which should be corrected. Tudor finance is a particularly precarious business to deal with, without careful research in the records, since with the exception of some very valuable tables in Scott's *Joint Stock Companies*, little in print is trustworthy. Far from being "not very productive" "from the point of view of the royal revenue", the rents of the crown lands were throughout the whole Tudor period one of the greatest sources of recurring royal income, and even after Elizabeth's latest sales the rents were still very large. The customs and tonnage and poundage were farmed only in certain ports; the £24,000 (increased later to £50,000) from the farm (stated by Dr. Tanner on the authority of Prothero) is only part of the income from this source in Elizabeth's reign. The impositions were not laid "to protect the native merchant against the alien", for every circumstance attending their imposition by Mary shows they were laid to increase revenue. In the matter of expenditures Ireland was "a" rather than "the" disturbing factor until the last five years of Queen Elizabeth. Much more disturbing than Ireland were the wars with France in the time of Henry VIII., Edward, and Mary, and the aid to the Netherlands and the war with Spain in Elizabeth's reign. Calais was not "a source of revenue" for many years before it was lost, but cost Henry VIII., Edward, and Mary very large sums each year before it was fortunately restored to France.

The documents are accompanied by an historical commentary at the head of each section, full of detailed knowledge of a kind useful in examinations. With that there can be no quarrel, since the book, despite its importance, is frankly first of all a text-book for use of

English university students. While very complete accounts of the history of each branch of the Tudor government are given, owing to the form of the book the relative importance and connections of all the various organs are difficult to show as clearly as might be desired. The modern student of constitutional history is not, however, satisfied with a constitutional history which stops here. He desires to understand the cultural and economic basis of the government—the classes which form it and the cultural and economic forces which placed them in control. The nineteenth-century idea of the Tudor state as the “people at large” rallying around the hero kings of the house of Tudor, which seems to be accepted by Dr. Tanner, is not sufficient for the modern historian. The improvement of roads, which lessened distance; the development of the new science of bookkeeping and accountancy, which made supervision over vast extents of land from a distance possible; the rise of the gentry to new economic wealth through changes in methods of agriculture; the education of their sons either in law at the universities or in accountancy and bookkeeping in the houses of the great nobles, are very pertinent for the advent and continuation of the new centralized gentry commonwealth which is called the Tudor monarchy—and these factors are entirely overlooked in this really monumental work.

F. C. DIETZ.

English Government Finance, 1485-1558. By FREDERICK C. DIETZ, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, University of Illinois. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. IX., no. 3.] (Urbana: the University. 1920. Pp. 245.)

THE first impression made by a reading of this excellent monograph is of its thoroughness. Notwithstanding the difficulties of the subject, the unusualness of the sources, the technicalities of sixteenth-century finance, and the obscurity of the devices of kings and ministers to obtain funds, no question arises without being thoroughly examined and clearly answered. Early Tudor finance is a closed book to almost all historical students. Mr. Dietz puts a wide-open volume in their hands.

The second impression is of the striking extent to which historical events can be clarified by studying their financial background. Not that the whole foreign policy of Henry VII., or the Reformation under Henry VIII., or the reaction under Mary, are to be explained as mere financial expedients of those rulers; but these events certainly have a new significance when it is seen how many steps in their development were taken in response to financial needs. The “Submission of the Clergy” of 1531, for instance, was a device for reaching two ends at the same time, and apparently, of equal interest to the king, his acknowledgment as head of the Church and additional income in a period of diminishing revenue and rising expense. Concomitant with all the

early measures of the Reformation was a financial policy forced upon the king and his minister by the danger of attack from Spain due to those measures. Long before the attack upon the monasteries, financial need had suggested and indeed made imminent the almost complete confiscation of the possessions of the Church, secular as well as temporal. It is an interesting parallel to see Henry VII. recuperating his finances at the expense of the nobility, Henry VIII. at the expense of the Church. The study of financial records in this degree of detail and thoroughness serves an almost equally useful purpose in the interpretation of some prominent personalities. The growth of the Empson and Dudley legend, with its partial justification, the inferiority of Wolsey and the excellence of Cromwell as finance ministers, the reckless financing of the period of Edward VI. and the partial rehabilitation in the reign of Mary, preparing a better soil for the growth of Elizabethan financial solidity, are all substantial contributions to a sane and trustworthy knowledge of history.

Nowhere in all history, not even in recent world experience, does the terrible cost of war and its baneful effect directly on finance and indirectly on many other sides of national life come out more clearly than in the difference between the careful, systematic, enlightened financial arrangements of the best period of the reign of Henry VII. and the reckless expenditure of his father's savings by Henry VIII. in his first and least justifiable war with France and the oppressive and injurious and undignified taxation compelled by his second.

It would be pleasant, if there were room, to pay tribute to Mr. Dietz's industry, independence of judgment, breadth of view that raise a somewhat technical study to the level of good general history; but the few remaining lines must be devoted somewhat reluctantly to a less pleasing criticism; that is, of the very bad proof-reading. This is not a captious criticism; mistakes of spelling, of figures, of prepositions, when frequent, give the reader a sense of uncertainty, a doubt of other names, figures, and statements which are almost certainly correct but are weakened in authority by the proximity of those which are certainly wrong. Such are, for instance, "Henry VI." for "Henry VII.", on page 54, and "of France" for "by France", a few lines below; "Henry III." for "Henry VIII." in a foot-note on page 47; "conventional" for "conventual" twice on page 109, following two mistakes in the spelling of proper names. Without further emphasizing this point, it may be remarked, first, that it is especially incumbent on a university series of publications to give an example of all rectitude to merely commercial publishers; and, secondly, that even the author of an excellent historical production must submit to have his work criticized in such particulars as may be for the future good of the cause. Henry C. Lea, who was both a publisher and a historian, once said to the reviewer that it had been an unfulfilled ambition of his life to get out a book in which there

was not a single misprint. In the last volume published before his death, in a foot-note "1639" appears for "1369".

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Étude sur le Gouvernement de François I^{er} dans ses Rapports avec le Parlement de Paris. Par ROGER DOUCET, Agrégé d'Histoire, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger. Volume I., 1515-1525. (Paris: Édouard Champion. 1921. Pp. 379. 20 fr.)

THIS is a very interesting book. Its purpose is to show how "the traditional and still feudal monarchy of Louis XII." began to be converted, under Francis I., into the centralized absolutism which reached its culmination under Louis XIV. The method adopted is to describe a series of conflicts between the king and the Parlement de Paris, which was dominated, more than any other part of the body politic, by the methods and ideals of the preceding age, and therefore naturally became the centre of the forces opposed to the crown.

After an illuminating chapter on the political theories of the first part of the sixteenth century, the author takes up the problem of the relations of Church and State, which was brought to the fore by the Concordat of 1516. The king, who aspired completely to subject the French church to his own authority, cared solely for the maintenance of those of its "liberties" which rendered it independent of the pope: the Parlement, on the other hand, harked back to the system established by the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. "Gallicanisme royal" and "gallicanisme parlementaire" found themselves, for the first time, in direct opposition; but it was "gallicanisme royal" that won the day. Next comes the question of finance. New methods of obtaining revenue and credit were being invented, which rendered the king independent not only of grants from the national and local estates, but also of the tutelage of the *gens de finance*, to whom his predecessors had been constantly obliged to have recourse. The Parlement did not like the way things were going, and sought to put on the brake by an occasional refusal to register an edict or to sanction the creation of a new official; its opposition, however, was not sufficiently systematic or continuous to be effective. The king's power, on the other hand, was immensely strengthened, not only financially, but territorially and politically as well, by the results of the treason of the Duc de Bourbon, and the confiscation of his vast domains. A final chapter takes up the differences between the king on the one hand, and the Parlement and the University of Paris on the other, over the treatment to be accorded to the disciples of Lefèvre d'Étaples. Francis had little or no love for the Reformers, but he was far too much engrossed in other affairs to give enthusiastic support to a policy of persecution. The Parlement and the university, however, were consistent in their demands for the

suppression of heresy; and in this matter at least, as the latter part of the reign was to prove, they were unfortunately able to make good their contentions.

Everywhere else, however, the monarchy triumphed; and perhaps the most interesting thing about the whole story is that the crown should have gained the victory with such an unworthy representative. It has become a favorite pastime for historians of the sixteenth century "to hurl", as Bishop Stubbs once expressed it, "another stone at Francis I.", but lapidation has not hitherto been frequent until after the disaster of Pavia in 1525; during the first ten years of his reign it has been usual to represent the king in a more favorable light. M. Doucet, however, clearly shows that the same bad qualities which all men recognized at the close of Francis's life were present from the first—tyrannical instincts, weakness of will, and sudden outbursts of furious rage. Moreover, the king's attention was chiefly centred on foreign affairs, and such continuity and system as were visible in the internal management of the realm were for the most part due to his ministers; it was almost a case of "absolutisme sans le roi". On the other hand, the Parlement and the other bodies opposed to the crown were not favorably situated for effective resistance. Their claims to authority were based less on positive laws than on traditions which the increasingly monarchical atmosphere of the day was rapidly stifling. They dealt, or attempted to deal, with each case as it came up, in a different way, and not according to any fundamental principle; and they labored under the disadvantage that they often seemed to be acting less in the interests of the country as a whole than in those of the *gens de robe*. Under all the circumstances, they were almost foredoomed to defeat.

All students of the sixteenth century will be grateful to M. Doucet for this painstaking analysis, and will look forward with lively anticipation to the publication of his two remaining volumes.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami, denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., Collegii Mertonensis Socium, et H. M. ALLEN. Tomus IV., 1519-1521. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1922. Pp. xxxii, 639. 28s.)

AFTER an interval of nine years, sufficiently explained by the crowding of other, larger interests and by the technical difficulties of publication caused by the war, Mr. Allen returns to his task with undiminished ability and zeal. The same qualities of painstaking accuracy and judicious criticism which marked the earlier volumes are present here. If one could ever speak of a "final" edition, it would be in place to say here: "This work will never have to be done again." Problems there will always be, and it is one of Mr. Allen's chief merits as an editor that he seldom indulges in finalities of any sort. One does not find in his work the *ohne Zweifel* and the *nachgewiesen* of German criticism.

In the ticklish matter of chronology, for example, he is notably free from dogmatism. He points to the evidence in specific cases, but does not claim infallibility for any definite scheme of his own. Such flexibility is especially important in the case of the Erasmian correspondence because the meaning of a given letter is often to be determined only by its time-relation to other letters or to some group of events. Any fixed scheme is sure to involve perplexities and contradictions most baffling to the historian, whose interest it is to estimate the value of Erasmus's services to learning and to enlightenment.

The three years covered by the 260 letters of this volume, 1519, 1520, and 1521, are, perhaps, the most critical and in many ways the most interesting in Erasmus's whole experience. He had reached the summit of his fame as a scholar and as a sharp-tongued critic of contemporary manners and ideas. He was distinctly the most famous man of letters of his time. Yet it was precisely this conspicuous eminence that led him into his most trying situations. Up to this time he had moved steadily along his chosen way without notable friction, but now, since the fateful Leipzig disputation of 1519, the great proclamations and the excommunication of 1520, and the double ban of 1521, the Lutheran affair had come crowding in upon his purely intellectual preoccupations, with a challenge he dared not accept, yet could not altogether refuse.

That is one of the undercurrents that run through the whole correspondence of these critical years. The other is the rather pitiful controversy with the Englishman Edward Lee, an antagonist quite unworthy of his steel, but peculiarly annoying because his attack was directed to the great scholar's most sensitive point, his scholarly ability. In 1516 he had documented his learning and his essential orthodoxy by his monumental edition of the Greek New Testament and his comments thereon. Frankly admitting certain slips and incompletenesses, he was proceeding to a new edition when the busy swarm of the scholastikers came buzzing about his ears. Lee made himself the mouthpiece of this party; Erasmus replied in kind, and there ensued the bitter squabble reflected in almost every utterance of his during this period. To keep himself free from entanglement with either of the two religious parties and to defend the soundness of his scholarship: these were his absorbing interests.

Of the letters here given eight are printed for the first time, but none of these makes any important contribution to our knowledge. Valuable *addenda* with a few *corrigenda* to all four volumes occupy twelve pages, and two appendixes, nos. XIV. and XV., give interesting biographical details. Although no definite promise of continuance is made in the preface, it is a pleasure to notice (p. 621) reference to numbers so far ahead as to indicate substantial work already done on succeeding volumes. A provisional index of correspondents for volumes I.-IV. will be replaced by a fuller one when the work is completed.

La Légation du Cardinal Morone près l'Empereur et le Concile de Trente, Avril-Décembre 1563. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. no. 233.] Par G. CONSTANT, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris: Édouard Champion. 1922. Pp. lxxv, 612. 50 fr.)

M. CONSTANT's work has a long prenatal history. Presented as second thesis for the doctorate at the Sorbonne, it was approved and permission to print given after a favorable report of M. Pfister, now dean of the Faculty of Letters at Strasbourg. The manuscript was then sent to a printer at Lille, and was actually set up in type just as the Germans entered Lille in the autumn of 1914. Having need of type for their own purposes, the invaders redistributed the letters. Work on it was again taken up in August, 1920, and at last it has appeared.

That we now have the results of M. Constant's labors is a subject of congratulation to ourselves even more than to him. This edition of Morone's correspondence and of other documents relating to his legation at the court of Ferdinand and at the Council of Trent, during the last months of its session, is a work of importance done in a practically faultless manner. That a few of the documents here published have appeared elsewhere during the long period while the book remained in manuscript, does not really hurt it. Neither the great series of acts and diaries of the Council of Trent, nor the *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, have touched the subject here presented, nor has Pastor published any of it among the documents appended to his *History of the Popes*. M. Constant not only prints the texts in acceptable form but elucidates them with a wealth of learning.

Giovanni Morone of Milan was one of the ablest diplomats of his time. At the age of twenty, in 1529, he satisfactorily discharged a mission for Pope Clement VII. at the court of France. Later he was sent as nuncio to Germany several times, and proved his value as a peacemaker after the too belligerent zeal of Aleander. In fact, his advanced opinions and his championship of an Italian book later branded as heretical gave offense in some Catholic quarters, even while he thus made his services more acceptable to the reforming party. The crowning achievement of his career was the mission to Ferdinand and to the Council of Trent here so fully set forth in the original documents. The Emperor was both afraid to affront the German Protestants and anxious to carry through a reform in the Catholic church. A short quotation from one of the memorials he drew up on the subject shows his boldness in interfering with the ecclesiastical power:

Quoniam in iis quae ad aedificandam Ecclesiam ac continendum in religione christianum populum attinent, nimia quaedam negligentia, imo torpor et quasi veternus quidam eos qui haec curare debebant invasit, factum est ut nimia haereticorum diligentia, dum videlicet Petrus dormit, Judas vigilat, ipsa propemodum Ecclesiae fundamenta et bases subruere coeperint.

How Morone parried these attempts of the Emperor, how Borromeo, who often acted for Pius IV., proposed a counter-reform of the temporal power by the Church, how Morone stood for the papal initiative known as the "legatis proponentibus", how he advised against the excommunication of Elizabeth, how he finally brought the council to the end ardently desired by the pope, and how he received the hearty thanks of the Curia for his great services,—all this is set forth in the present useful compilation with a fullness not found elsewhere.

PRESERVED SMITH.

Histoire de la Marine Française. Tome V. La Guerre de Trente Ans: Colbert. Par CHARLES DE LA RONCIÈRE, Conservateur à la Bibliothèque Nationale. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1920. Pp. 748. 40 fr.)

THERE are few additions to our knowledge of naval history that are more warmly welcomed than a new volume of M. de la Roncière's monumental work. Students know well what to expect from it and in the present installment they will find all the familiar qualities which they have learned to appreciate. There is the same exhaustive care, the same wealth of documentation, and the same wide reading in a cosmopolitan mass of authorities. Nothing in any language that could elucidate the subject or place it firmly in its international setting seems to have been overlooked, and the result is that the student feels he can resort to the book with a sense of unusual security.

The volume covers the period from 1635 to 1682. Opening with a continuation of Richelieu's work it gives us an intimate picture of how he endeavored to use the new weapon he had striven to create to influence and enhance the position of France during the Thirty Years War, and how Mazarin built on the foundations his master had laid. Here, in the section on the "War with Spain" (1648-1659), we are given an interesting sight of the first efforts of the Cromwellian navy through French eyes. The point of view is indeed wholly French, and with little or no sympathetic appreciation of the difficulties and ideals of the new-born island republic. But it is none the worse for that, since we have only to master a passing sense of irritation to find we have a brighter light on the natural but intense prejudices which Cromwell's foreign policy had to overcome and to see in the fact that they were overcome in the alliance that eventuated what a solvent of international difficulties a powerful navy can be.

From this point, with a passing cry of lamentation over the withering of the colonial policy which Richelieu had inaugurated, we pass to the last of the Crusades, the "Candian War", and see the medieval enthusiasms of the men that fought contrasted in the men that planned with a wholly modern appreciation of what the command of the Mediterranean meant. It is not within the scope of M. de la Roncière's purpose

to develop such aspects of the history he is writing. Those who know his previous volumes will not expect it. It is sufficient that with rare restraint he has devoted his space and powers to a sober presentation of the facts, which have so long been wanting in their entirety, and has left others well equipped to draw the wider conclusions. They are indeed very obvious and the whole of this section as well as the later one on "France against Continental Europe" will be read as an illuminating prologue to the complex naval and military problems of the following century, in which the forces at the back of the operations of M. de la Roncière's narrative reasserted themselves with ever increasing intensity and in endless variety, till years after Trafalgar was fought. In the period of the present volume we have of course no more than the first traces of the compelling call of the Mediterranean on the Atlantic Maritime Powers, but in the exploits of the Cromwellian admirals and in the Dutch wars—particularly the third—we are shown the pregnant beginnings.

The first Dutch war has been so thoroughly explored in the publications of the British Navy Records Society that it is not to be expected that M. de la Roncière could add much to existing knowledge. For the others he has more to say that is new. Possibly the most interesting contribution he has to make is his treatment of the Battle of Solebay. It is a mark of his general detachment that he does not seek to disguise the sorry part which the French fleet played nor can he find, as was to be hoped, a satisfactory explanation. All he can do is by a skillful selection of extracts to give a vivid impression of the controversy which raged in the French fleet itself after the battle and of the shame and anger that was felt in France in contrast with the high admiration which Michael de Ruyter inspired. As soon as the combined fleet was back in the Thames d'Estrées and Duquesne had each a party in hot altercation and there was a third abusing them both, while Colbert was denouncing d'Estrées for the modesty of his despatch and impressing the doctrine that though modesty is all very well in a private individual it is not a virtue in a commander-in-chief speaking of the arms of the king. The art of writing a despatch, he explains, is to exalt the glory of the nation by emphasizing the exploits of individuals and concealing their shortcomings. Clearly more was expected from the untried fleet, and there seems no foundation for a widespread belief that d'Estrées had instructions to husband his fleet for ulterior objects. On the contrary it appears that the French officers had formal orders from the king to show the English that they would not yield a point to them in valor and staunchness but would even surpass them. The simple explanation seems to lie in the difficulty, which in the British service had been fairly well overcome during the Commonwealth, of providing adequate command for a fleet. Sailors who were accomplished seamen had little experience of tactics or the conduct of large forces. Soldiers who had the experience knew little of the sea. Both were necessary, and

conflict and jealousy were almost inevitable. A general like d'Estrées would not brook the open contempt of an accomplished seaman like Duquesne, and Duquesne being only second in command was not too ready to repair the mistakes of his inexperienced chief. The idea that the French were purposely held back may well have arisen from a general direction that appears to have been given to captains not to engage too precipitately. It was probably the outcome of a piece of advice which M. de la Roncière tells us Charles II. gave when he visited the French fleet at Spithead. Praising the vigor and courage of his allies he warned them that too much ardor may upset the order that is essential in naval actions, and particularly the French predilection for boarding. "It is wrong", he said "to attempt boarding till the enemy is in thorough disorder and even then instead of being content with three or four prizes, the object must be the complete destruction of the enemy's fleet." Strange as it may seem there was a strong touch of Nelson in the Merry Monarch, and if the French showed a marked respect for his opinion it is no wonder.

The mystery of Solebay is but one of the many points on which M. de la Roncière throws fresh light, but it serves well to show how much the richer we are for his long and unremitting labor. Nor is it only on naval operations that his work has value. There is also a section on Colbert's administration which gives in detail a comprehensive account of everything that went to establish France as a first-class naval power and another on the collateral activities of the Compagnie des Indes Orientales. The volume concludes with the effort made in the years 1680-1683 to curb the Barbary pirates and so rounds off an imperfectly known chapter in history with a fullness of matter which must long remain indispensable for the special period and even beyond the special subject.

JULIAN S. CORBETT.

The Empire at War. Edited by Sir CHARLES LUCAS, K.C.B., K.C.M.G. [For the Royal Colonial Institute.] Volume I. (Oxford: University Press. 1921. Pp. xi, 324. 15s.)

WHILE the World War was in progress the Royal Colonial Institute planned a comprehensive historical work on the subject of British imperial defense, the purpose being "to trace the growth of Imperial co-operation in war time prior to the late War, to give side by side a complete record of the effort made in the late War by every unit of the Overseas Empire from the greatest to the smallest, and also to tell in what particular ways and to what extent the fortunes and the development of each part were affected by the War". When complete it is to consist of five volumes, of which the first, by the general editor, Sir Charles Lucas, has now appeared. The period surveyed in this introductory volume extends from 1655, when troops recruited in the English

West Indies participated in the conquest of Jamaica, to the great uprising throughout the empire in the August days of 1914. The author's principal object is to show how the colonies and dependencies have co-operated in the military and naval defense of the empire. His qualifications for the task need not be enlarged upon here.

Military co-operation came first in point of time. The withdrawal of the British garrisons from the self-governing colonies, which took place during the sixties and seventies of the last century, threw upon those colonies the responsibility for their own military defense, and contributed to the development among them of a new sense of imperial partnership. "I have not the smallest doubt", said Gladstone in 1861, "that in the proportion that responsibilities are accepted by communities, they will be more disposed to go beyond the bare idea of self-defence, and to render loyal and effective assistance in the struggles of the Empire," and abundantly have events justified his confidence. When in 1885, following the tragedy of Gordon at Khartoum, New South Wales, of its own free will and at its own expense, sent a military contingent to the Sudan, the greater efforts made by the dominions in the South African War and in the World War were forecast. In addition to giving a careful description of the development of defense forces in all the self-governing colonies, the author devotes several chapters to the Indian army and its activities. Here, however, he is not dealing with voluntary co-operation, as in the case of the self-governing colonies, for, as he says, "Imperial co-operation in the dependent half of the Empire was a matter of dictation by the central authority." He is not concerned to draw the line between defense and offense—perhaps it cannot be drawn sharply—but the Indian army has proved a most effective instrument for carrying on operations that can scarcely be called defensive. "Only in the light of the late war", writes Sir Charles, "have we realized the hideous possibilities which would assuredly emerge from a Germanized Asia or Africa—countless legions of coloured janissaries, trained and organized to follow leaders as ruthless as they are resolute, and to impose the will of their masters upon a terrorized world." No one who agrees with him as to the general beneficence of British imperial rule would stigmatize as "janissaries" the Indian mercenaries who have been such a potent factor in extending that rule, but unfriendly critics of British imperialism might do so. It is all a question of the point of view.

In naval as in military defense the same principle of co-operation is to be observed. Responsibility for naval self-defense was not thrust upon the self-governing colonies by any action of the mother country, but was voluntarily assumed by them, in greater or less degree, and by 1902 all of them, except Canada, which under the Laurier régime was following a policy of "friendly isolation", were contributing in one form or another, each as it saw fit. Before 1914 Australian nationality had

expressed itself in the creation of a dominion navy, entirely under Australian control in time of peace but to act as a part of the greater imperial navy in time of war. The history of the dominion defense forces, military and naval, as the author relates it, throws much light upon the constitutional character of the British commonwealth of nations.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER.

British History in the Nineteenth Century (1782-1901). By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1922. Pp. xvi, 445. 12 s. 6 d.)

"THE philosophy of Dr. Johnson's England was static, not evolutionary: the world was not expected to change. Civilisation, it was thought, had 'arrived', after a number of barbarous ages, and was going to stay comfortably where it was." The idea of "progress" did not occupy, much less haunt, the mind of Dr. Johnson and his contemporaries. Britain was a self-satisfied and reasonably happy island. Life was largely rural, simple, and essentially medieval in its methods of production. A capable aristocracy shouldered the high obligations of nobility; the lower orders accepted without question the stations to which Providence had assigned them. If there was much physical and moral degradation in the darker corners of the land, it was off the accustomed highways of those who dwelt in the sun, and, besides, as none conceived of progress, all accepted wretchedness as a matter of course.

Such was the complacent island now rudely shocked by the unthinkable and unholy ideas and processes of the French Revolution and undermined with the irresistibility of fate by the unseen forces of the Industrial Revolution. Out of this situation sprang the conflicting elements that gave distinctive character to British history in the nineteenth century. The spirit of Old England was the spirit of immobility; the spirit of nineteenth-century England was the spirit of change. The profound economic and social changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution made it difficult for the civilization of Dr. Johnson's England "to stay comfortably where it was". A "matchless constitution" no longer sufficed. This newly created problem of readjustment would have been comparatively simple if the Industrial Revolution could have run its course and congealed, but its processes were continuous and progressive throughout the century. The problem was, therefore, one of successive adjustments to keep pace with a society changing with a rapidity unparalleled in history. In a succession of crises it was British political sagacity that preserved England from the experiences of the Continent and permitted the triumphant forward march of the English constitution.

This, in essence, is Mr. Trevelyan's conception of the meaning of nineteenth-century British history. It emphasizes the vital relation of economic and social factors to political history, political history being the

surface indications of what lies deeper. This kind of study, based largely on contemporary sources, some of which have received scant attention hitherto, imparts vitality and a sense of reality to Mr. Trevelyan's narrative. In the distinctive features which flow from such a conception of his task most readers will probably find the strength and value of his book, particularly in the illuminating treatment of the confusing currents of the great reform movements and the by-play of politics. Those parts dealing with imperial and foreign affairs, displaying a fair degree of honest British prejudice, are essentially traditional in treatment and less enlightening. Readers who are sympathetic to Mr. Trevelyan's general point of view will regret to find that the splendid execution of his plan in the first part of the work is not sustained throughout. After the struggle for the Bill of 1832 the relation of economic and social to political affairs becomes blurred, and the narrative lapses noticeably to the traditional political account.

This is Mr. Trevelyan's third contribution to nineteenth-century history. With memories still vivid of the admirable biographies of Grey and Bright one can hardly lay aside this latest book without some feeling of disappointment. The author's felicity or brilliancy of phrase has lost none of its charm, but he has not marshalled his materials in so masterly a fashion. A rather strict adherence to chronological treatment has broken the continuity in the development of particular movements and has brought a medley of topics into certain chapters, producing an unpleasant sensation of scrappiness, sometimes of confusion. Some readers, too, will question the wisdom of devoting some fifty pages to the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period in a work of 424 pages on British history, while the period since 1870 is crowded into 84. Be it so; whenever Mr. Trevelyan writes, American students of history will read with satisfaction, for his scholarship, his unusual opportunities to get at sources inaccessible to American students, his mastery of language, all contribute to make what he writes thoroughly worth while.

GEORGE HEDGER.

The French Revolution. By GEORGE H. ALLEN, Ph.D. Volume I. *The Prelude.* (Philadelphia: George Barrie's Sons. 1922. Pp. xxi, 319. \$9.00.)

THIS is the first installment of an extended work on the French Revolution, undertaken because the author believes that revolutionary changes are the most significant result of the recent war and that, accordingly, the study of an equally great, and somewhat analogous, upheaval will prove to be opportune. He does not look upon the French prototype as a horrible example, as do his publishers, who in a long introductory "Note", bound with the volume, declare that it was the "supreme experiment in social democracy" and that if the Russians had reflected sufficiently on its disastrous consequences they might "have

saved themselves many sorrows". He explains that it "conferred inestimable benefits on mankind". In the first volume, called *The Prelude*, he carries the story to the end of July, 1789. About half the chapters are devoted to a sketch of the development of the kingdom prior to the accession of Louis XVI. It is written in an agreeable style and with a sympathetic tone, but the treatment is superficial and is marred by too many errors. The amount of attention paid to the royal mistresses is characteristic. The life of the people and especially of the peasantry is described in a perfunctory manner. The close resemblance of certain statements to passages in Lowell's *Eve of the French Revolution* does not seem to argue serious independent investigation of the subject. For example, the résumé of the Four Articles of 1682 which Lowell gives appears with hardly the change of a word. Among the errors is the mention twice of the princes of Condé and of Conti as the sons of the Count of Artois. The number of dioceses in France is not stated correctly, apparently through a misreading of Lowell's figures. On page 211 Rohan is called "Archbishop" of Strasbourg, while on page 101 Strasbourg is rightly referred to as a bishopric. A more curious error is the explanation under a print of the Diamond Necklace that it is "From the original in possession of the French government". According to the context this can only refer to the necklace. The same print appears in Funck-Brentano's little volume on the Diamond Necklace, but the distinguished Frenchman does not intimate that his government is so fortunate as to have in its keeping the original. The Comte de la Motte is supposed to have broken up the necklace and sold the stones in London. Another error may be mentioned. It is said that "the court required that the old costumes of 1614 be worn in the States-General" to maintain the distinction between the orders. In the official directions concerning costume the only reference to the period of the States General of 1614 is to the effect that the noble deputy's hat shall be "retroussé à la Henri IV." The deputies of the Third Estate were to have "un manteau court . . . tel que les personnes de robe sont dans l'usage de la porter à la cour; . . . un chapeau . . . tel que les ecclésiastiques le portent lorsqu'ils sont en habit de cour".

B.

The Economic Causes of Modern War: a Study of the Period 1878-1918. By JOHN BAKELESS, M.A. [Williams College, David A. Wells Prize Essays, Number 6.] (New York: printed for the Department of Political Science of Williams College by Moffat, Yard, and Company. 1921. Pp. xiv, 265. \$4.00.)

A DISTINCT service has been rendered to the reading, thinking world by this clear and scholarly survey of the economic causes of the wars which have afflicted mankind during the last generation. In the forty-

year period 1878-1918 the world was free from armed conflict only four years, while over fifty wars are entered in the record. With peculiar freedom from bias the author has searched the records of the twenty major conflicts of this period to find the dominant causal influences. He discriminates between the immediate occasion of conflict, often trivial in character, and the real influences at work. It is no surprise to a geographer to see such a study go at once to the roots of things, and to find that the geographic and economic relations are predominant in the causes of most of the wars which history records.

The author devotes a chapter to the economic causes of the wars of European nations in the scramble for colonies, and punctures the hypocritical self-abnegation advertised in the phrases "advance of civilization" and "the white man's burden".

The twenty major conflicts in the modern period are discussed in a valuable chapter, and the significant economic influences noted—the Suez Canal in Egypt, gold and diamonds in South Africa, nitrates in Peru, Bolivia, and Chile, sugar in Cuba—the list runs on, an instructive survey.

In the chapter on the causes of the World War, it is shown clearly that "underneath all the clamor about making the world safe for democracy, the sins of militarism, the guilt of the German, the neutrality of Belgium, and the saving of civilization from the beast, has lain the economic motive".

The succeeding chapters discuss the prevention of war by international finance, internationalism and economic conflict, and the League of Nations. And the breadth of view, the fair statement of the causes involved, and the sanity of judgment of the author carry through to the end.

In a work so entirely excellent, it seems a bit ungenerous to criticize adversely. What the reviewer offers is intended as constructive criticism. We find (p. 18) that "an overpopulated state can not be agricultural; it must turn to industry". Patently we are here forgetting India's 300,000,000 and China's 400,000,000, nearly half the population of the earth, and almost wholly agricultural. In the Western world, states have become overpopulated by *becoming* industrial. And in this age of labor-saving machinery, it is only the state or region blessed with the inanimate power of *coal*, which can work up the iron, and run the factories and the transportation services, by which dense populations may be supported. It is the bank account of *coal* and *iron* more than it is British blood, or the position of the British Isles, that in the final analysis accounts for British commercial development and financial leadership. The material foundation of the rise of Germany, and the sanction upon which a Junker programme of world domination could be built, was the possession upon German soil of more than twice the coal resource of Britain. Moreover, it is not merely a difference in blood and culture

which marks the "decadence" of France. The rural population of Germany showed an absolute decline between the years 1871 and 1914. The increase in German population in that period was due wholly to the growth of industrial cities, made possible by the use of coal. Had the coal-fields been in France and not in Germany, it is not conceivable that the urban population would not have developed in France, with Germany showing decadence.

Nor is it true, as stated later, that there has been "a decrease in German agriculture, since an agricultural country cannot be densely populated". German agriculture did not show a decrease. In only one significant line, the number of sheep, has there been a decrease, and military strategy can give a very good reason for that. This fallacy occurs again: "Germany was . . . a state *completely* dependent upon other states for . . . almost all the food of a population which averages 310 to the square mile." This is wide of the mark. A German estimate (1914) had only 19 per cent. of the population dependent upon the outside world for food.

In his analysis of the causes of the World War the author does not mention the tremendous significance of Haber's method of the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, nor of the integration of German capital in its syndicated banks, and their control of industry, commerce, and the press. Nor is there a proper presentation of the power of the German Kartell, and of German "dumping", nor is there a suggestion of the tragic significance (to Germany) of the anti-dumping law invented by Canada in 1908 and copied by South Africa shortly after.

And yet, the volume is a very valuable contribution to the literature of international relations, and is recommended without reservation to students and teachers in this field.

J. PAUL GOODE.

Some Revolutions and other Diplomatic Experiences. By the late Right Hon. Sir HENRY G. ELLIOT, G.C.B. Edited by his Daughter. (London: John Murray. 1922. Pp. xv, 300. 16s.)

ELLIOT enjoyed a long diplomatic career, but the reader of these interesting, though not entirely trustworthy, records of imperial policy and official eavesdropping may be permitted to doubt whether the course of his career was determined altogether by his ability. He was second son (1817-1907) of the second Earl of Minto and was brother-in-law of Lord John Russell; he belonged to the dynasty of the old British Foreign Office. Eighteen years had been spent in diplomatic service at St. Petersburg, the Hague, Vienna, and Copenhagen before 1859, when he was appointed minister to Naples. The detailed reminiscences begin with this mission, which occupies a full third of the volume, and regarding which abundant quotations are made from a diary, and from letters of the period addressed to the writer's brother George, private secretary of Lord John Russell.

The principal revelation of this section of the reminiscences is the animus against Italy, and against Italians of all parties, shown by Elliot throughout. The uninitiated have been led by historians hitherto to suppose that the British minister at Naples in 1860 had much sympathy for Italy; but the error is now made clear from the minister's own contemporary statements. He is particularly hard upon the Neapolitans, who, he says, "will not tell the truth when a lie will answer their purpose" (p. 101), and who, according to his view, did nothing to help Garibaldi in his famous revolutionary undertaking; "Sicilians" are "fit for nothing" (p. 86); Garibaldi's Thousand had "scarcely a shred of character among them" (p. 18); Victor Emmanuel II. is accused of "treacherous duplicity" (p. 24), and Garibaldi of having encouraged assassination (p. 88). Yet in the end Elliot favored the annexation of the Two Sicilies to Piedmont as best for British interests.

One should remember, in reading these light-hearted accusations, not only that Elliot had had no experience in Italy prior to 1859, but that his most mature previous diplomatic experience, saving a brief stay at Copenhagen, had been at Vienna, where all that made for the reawakening of Italy was decried as detrimental to the interests of Austria; and even Palmerston had pronounced support of Austria as of primary importance to England herself.

The principal events of the Neapolitan mission described in the reminiscences had already been given in Elliot's despatches published in contemporary British blue-books. But many new details of interest are given; reports of conversations with the Sardinian minister Villamarina are valuable; and Elliot's account of Captain Palmer's secret gift of American powder to Garibaldi in the critical hour of Palermo is amusing: Palmer's warship, the *Iroquois*, was left "so short of powder that she cannot even fire a salute" (p. 39). Elliot's gravest error was in sweepingly condemning Sicilians and Neapolitans for having rendered no effective aid to Garibaldi: "The Sicilians, Calabrians and other south country volunteers" were "absolutely useless" (p. 94); not a single Neapolitan "that I have heard of joined Garibaldi or risked the tip of his nose" (p. 93). How then, we may ask, did Garibaldi, with one thousand badly equipped volunteers, beat Francis II., who had a trained army of 130,000 men? Had Elliot, who declined to believe in the miracle by St. Januarius (p. 14), been persuaded to believe in a miracle by Garibaldi? Furthermore, in criticizing deficiency of revolutionary activity on the part of the Neapolitans themselves, he fails to take into consideration his own statement that 150,000 liberals had been condemned to such police surveillance as to make early revolutionary action on their part impossible (p. 9); and he forgets that there were 46 Neapolitans who had managed to enlist in Garibaldi's Thousand, their risk having been, if captured, reasonably certain death.

Elliot had quite as little sympathy for the French as for the Italians, and could never get on pleasantly with his French colleagues, with Brenier

at Naples, with Bourée at Athens, which was his next post, or with Bourgoing at Constantinople, where he remained from 1867 till 1876. He hated the Russians fiercely and consistently, and the Russian ambassador at Constantinople, Ignatiev, in particular.

Those with whom he deeply sympathized were the Austrians and the Turks, the two peoples which represented the negation of the great principle of nationality. His prejudice in favor of Austria blinded him to the latter's deliberate design of aggrandizement and annexation during the revolution in Bosnia and Herzegovina of 1875-1877 (p. 212). And it was his well-known prejudice in favor of the Turks as against the Christians in the Near East which made him a leading figure in the scandal of withheld information upon the Bulgarian atrocities, which nearly overthrew the Beaconsfield cabinet in 1876. Elliot, charged with having misinformed his own government then, devotes to his defense several pages of the recollections, which in this part are of later date; he endeavors to throw upon Sir Philip Francis, British consul-general at Constantinople, blame for having withheld from the embassy a vice-consular despatch. But the son of Francis has impugned the truth of the recollections in this regard (*London Times Literary Supplement*, May 4, 1922), claiming that vice-consuls were accustomed to send duplicates of political despatches directly to the embassy, so that the consul-general could not have been expected to forward his copy to Elliot; in any case the latter had culpably ignored at this time a signed report containing similar information upon Bulgarian atrocities received from Drs. Long and Washburn of Robert College.

This volume was privately printed by Elliot during his lifetime (1900); the editing of the present issue is by his daughter, who has faithfully supported the writer's prejudices in introduction, appendix, and notes.

H. NELSON GAY.

Russia's Foreign Relations during the Last Half Century. By Baron S. A. KORFF, D.C.L., Professor of Political Science, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. 227. \$2.25.)

THOSE who had the privilege of hearing the lectures so ably delivered by Baron Korff before the Institute of Politics at Williamstown last year, and a much wider public besides, will be rejoiced that these lectures have now appeared in book form. Russia's foreign policy of the past half-century has seldom been presented to American readers from the Russian standpoint; and in this case the author is not only a distinguished scholar, but a prominent Liberal, and one who has had close personal contacts with the men and affairs to be described.

The Congress of Berlin forms the starting-point of this survey, and the March revolution of 1917 its terminus. Within these limits the

author reviews successively the history of Russia's relations with France, England, China, Japan, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan states, Germany, and Sweden. This method of procedure inevitably involves a considerable amount of repetition, but it makes for clarity, and was probably preferable to a strictly chronological treatment. The final chapter is devoted to a very sensible analysis of the problem of secret diplomacy.

Dealing in brief compass with so vast and difficult a subject, and made up of lectures addressed primarily to what may, with all respect, be called a popular audience, this volume contains scarcely any facts not known to professional historians, and no diplomatic "revelations". It offers a clear, comprehensive, and concise summary of Russia's foreign relations during a momentous period. It presents many interesting views and side-lights, such as, for instance, the author's explanation of the disillusioned attitude of the Russian Liberals toward the alliance with France, or his regret that President Roosevelt forced on the Peace of Portsmouth prematurely, before the Autocracy had been forced to surrender at home, or his characterization of Panslavism as "prompted much more by hatred of Germany than by love of [the] Slavs" (p. 96). The book is written with serene impartiality, moderation, and freedom from patriotic rancor or prejudice. Indeed, the author criticizes his country's statesmen and policies rather more severely than those of foreign countries.

On the other hand, a fair number of errors have crept into the volume. One is a little surprised to read that the first deposition of Alexander of Battenberg on August 21, 1886, was the work of Stambolov (p. 120); that Germany at the end of 1897 first established herself in the Kwang-Tung peninsula and later exchanged that position for Kiaochow (pp. 63-64); or that the Young Turkish revolution of 1908 was altogether the work of Germany (who "deliberately let loose the Turkish revolutionary forces and carried out her eastern plans with great precision". "And everything was accomplished exclusively through German help and German inspiration"—pp. 136-137). The reviewer has been much mystified by the alleged proposal of Aehrenthal to the Powers in July, 1908, that Austria be allowed to annex the sanjak of Novibazar (p. 107). There are obvious contradictions between the statements made on pages 85 and 176 about Russian policy toward Sweden, and between the dates given on pages 45 and 141 for the treaty by which Russia was promised Constantinople.

The author remarks that in tracing Russia's foreign relations "one must keep in mind not only the social forces that move nations to certain ends and achieve national aims, but also the rôle played by the various personalities, the statesmen at the helm of their countries" (pp. 1 and 2). One could wish that Baron Korff had found the opportunity to discuss more at length both of these two great sets of factors; to give

a more detailed and adequate characterization of the leading Russian statesmen of the period, and a more systematic and complete analysis of the needs, motives, and aims that directed their foreign policy.

R. H. L.

Diplomatische Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Entente politik der Vorkriegsjahre. Herausgegeben von B. VON SIEBERT, ehemaliger Sekretär der Kaiserlich Russischen Botschaft in London. (Berlin and Leipzig: Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger. 1921. Pp. vi, 827. \$2.70 bound.)

Entente Diplomacy and the World: Matrix of the History of Europe, 1909-14. Translated from the Original Texts in his Possession by B. DE SIEBERT, late Secretary of the Imperial Russian Embassy at London. Edited, arranged, and annotated by GEORGE ABEL SCHREINER, Political and War Correspondent in Europe during the War of the Associated Press of America. (New York: Harper and Brothers.¹ 1921. Pp. xxxii, 762. \$9.00.)

THIS collection includes what are presumably the most important despatches exchanged between the Foreign Offices of St. Petersburg, London, and Paris, and the reports of the Russian diplomatic representatives at all the important European capitals. It covers the greatest variety of diplomatic action: the Far East, Persia, North Africa, the Balkans, the Austro-Serb problem, Constantinople, the Bagdad Railway, and the general relations of the Entente with the Triple Alliance. It is so complete that the main lines of Russian policy before the war can be drawn with a degree of accuracy rarely possible so soon after the events in question. The political significance of this publication is greater in that the German defense to the indictment of the Versailles Treaty (and the reparation clauses rest to a large extent upon Germany's responsibility therein stated) is based chiefly upon counter-charges directed against Russia.

There is nothing that leads the reviewer to doubt the authenticity of the documents, but it seems probable that the editors have not been entirely candid as to their provenance. De Siebert (as he is called in the American edition) or von Siebert (as he appears in the German), who was formerly secretary of the Russian Embassy at London, implies that the originals came into his possession in the course of his diplomatic duties. But such officials do not ordinarily retain copies of correspondence passing through their hands. It is curious also that he should have taken the trouble to translate the originals, which he states are in Russian, French, and English, into German, the language of the

¹ The book bears the name of this firm as publishers, but we are informed by them that they do not publish it, nor does the firm of Putnam, who printed it; copies can be obtained from the office of the periodical *Issues of Today*, 132 Nassau Street, New York. Ed.

European edition. Mr. Headlam-Morley, in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1922, asks whether these documents are not in fact copies taken before the war by German secret agents, whose success in securing Russian diplomatic papers is attested by the disclosures of the late Professor Schiemann and the memoirs of von Bethmann-Hollweg. If we accept this plausible explanation, it follows that this collection is fathered by the German government, which evidently hoped that the documents would discredit Entente policy. The same thought was perhaps in the mind of the American editor, Mr. Schreiner, who is well known as an anti-Entente journalist and who asserts in the periodical *Issues of Today* of June 18, 1921, that Sir George Buchanan at the orders of his government paid half a million pounds in a fruitless attempt to suppress these documents; no evidence accompanied this assertion and it is explicitly denied by Headlam-Morley.

However much we may regret that the historical introductions and annotations of the American edition have not been written by one possessing a more scholarly background and a less pronounced anti-Entente bias, the value of the documents remains; and their significance is the more to be emphasized if, as seems probable, Wilhelmstrasse had them in its possession before 1914. For they seem to indicate definitely that English policy was always essentially defensive; in every crisis England did her utmost to discover a peaceful solution. The understanding with Russia was obviously conceived not with the purpose of threatening Germany but merely to protect England from the menace of the German fleet. On the Russian side the defensive character of the Entente appears equally plain whether we cite the report of the Reval conversations or the documents of 1912 and 1913, which show that Russia insisted that she would not go to war to secure a port on the Adriatic for Serbia and continually exercised a restraining influence on the ambitions of the latter power. On the other hand, if the documents tend to acquit the Entente of aggressive intentions, they point the danger and stupidity of the complex system of alliance in which before the war all European statesmen were caught.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

What Really Happened at Paris: the Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919, by American Delegates. Edited by EDWARD MANDILL HOUSE and CHARLES SEYMOUR, Litt.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1921. Pp. xiii, 528. \$4.50.)

THE volume edited by Colonel House and Professor Seymour consists of a series of eighteen lectures delivered in the spring of 1921 by members of the American Delegation to the Peace Conference. A general idea of their range and value may be gathered from the following chapter heads: Preparations for Peace, by Sidney Edward Mezes; the Atmosphere and Organization of the Peace Conference, by Clive

Day; the New Boundaries of Germany, by Charles Homer Haskins; Poland, by Robert Howard Lord; the End of an Empire: Remnants of Austria-Hungary, by Charles Seymour; Fiume and the Adriatic Problem, by Douglas Wilson Johnson; Constantinople and the Balkans, by Isaiah Bowman; the Armenian Problem and the Disruption of Turkey, by William Linn Westermann; the Protection of Minorities and Natives in Transferred Territories, by Manley Ottmer Hudson; the Trial of the Kaiser, by James Brown Scott; Reparations, by Thomas William Lamont; the Economic Settlement, by Allyn Abbott Young; the Labor Clauses of the Treaty, by Samuel Gompers; the Economic Administration during the Armistice, by Herbert Hoover; the Atlantic Fleet in the Great War, by Admiral Henry Thomas Mayo; the Problem of Disarmament, by General Tasker Howard Bliss; the Making of the League of Nations, by David Hunter Miller; the Versailles Peace in Retrospect, by Colonel House.

Many of the authors were also members of the "Inquiry", brought together in 1917 to prepare data for the formulation of peace terms. There can therefore be no question as to their competence to present the American attitude. Professor Mezes tells us in the first chapter that President Wilson's Fourteen Points were based on a preliminary report of the "Inquiry" submitted early in January, 1918. Many of the contributors naturally therefore felt themselves committed to the defense of the Fourteen Points and it was hardly to be expected that we should find any serious *critique* of the latter in the light of practical experience at the Conference.

It is generally assumed that the question of nationality was equally acute everywhere in Europe and that the application of the principle was in all cases just and wise. Such was not the case. Investigators who visited the district can testify, for instance, that nationality was, at the time of the Armistice, not an issue in the grand-duchy of Teschen. Events have proved that it likewise was not so in the Prussian district of Allenstein. Nevertheless, the principle was invoked here as elsewhere and the flood-gates opened to intrigue and propaganda. From the point of view of statesmanship, it may have been as unwise to invoke it in this case as it would have been to do so in such settled political units as the state of Wisconsin or the once Italian district about Nice in France. Yet Professor Lord criticizes the Council of Ambassadors for awarding to the Czechs the whole mining region of Teschen "with slight regard for the rights and the vehemently expressed wishes of the Polish-speaking majority of the population". Nevertheless a plebiscite in the district of Allenstein proved that in spite of its "Polish-speaking majority" as determined by the experts, the district was overwhelmingly for union with a defeated Germany. Professor Lord is evidently so deeply committed to the principle of nationality as a panacea for the determination of just boundaries, that he feels called upon to explain that it is a backward population "among which the Polish national

movement was only in its first faint beginnings". May it not be equally true that the movement was here showing its last faint glimmerings, and that philosophic historians like Spengler and Count Keyserling are right when they hold that the nationalistic movement has now spent itself? If they are right the settlement at Versailles should be regarded as the end and not the beginning of the nationalistic era.

As the particular chapters of the volume were evidently prepared independently by their authors it was inevitable that in so large a field there should have been a number of divergencies of attitude. There are, however, occasional contradictions in statements of fact. For instance, Professor Seymour quite correctly states in his discussion of the Austro-Hungarian settlement (p. 102):

The demands of the Italians for annexation of the Tyrol as far north as the Brenner Pass were granted, as promised in the secret Treaty of London. It should not be forgotten that this problem was not considered by any territorial commission, since Italy refused to permit any discussion of her territorial claims except by the supreme council. France and Great Britain were bound by their promises, and President Wilson, early in the history of the Conference, agreed to Italian demands in this quarter.

Professor Johnson in his discussion of Fiume and the Adriatic Question contradicts this in stating (p. 118): "The American Government not only consistently refused to recognize the Treaty of London, a document held to be . . . fundamentally in opposition to the principles for which America was fighting, but early recognized the right of the Jugo-Slavs to rule themselves."

Professor Johnson failed to make clear that Fiume was not included in the territory to be ceded to Italy by the London Pact, and that Italy had never accepted the Fourteen-Points boundary line, even in the armistice with Austria. His discussion of the whole question is strongly *ex parte* and fails to present the reasons for the Italian claims, nor is there any hint that there was a group even in the American delegation who favored granting the Italian claims.

The ineffectiveness of the organization of the Conference is recognized by several of the writers, though later historians will probably insist more frankly upon its failure to square with the Fourteen Points. A Supreme Council which consisted of representatives of the Great Powers only, seemed to indicate that the recognition of the equal rights of great and small states was merely academic, especially after Japan was included, whose national rights were far less seriously involved than those of Belgium or Serbia.

In this connection there are contradictory statements as to how generally the members of the Supreme Council or the Council of Four accepted the views of experts. Professor Mezes assures us that only "in the rarest instances" were they modified (p. 8). Mr. Day is in accord with Professor Mezes. Professor Lord, however, says that

on "several occasions" the recommendations of the commission (on Poland) were "very substantially modified or quite set aside" (p. 72). Dr. Bowman goes even further. "Directly thereafter the Council of Four was organized, where decisions could be reached without the bother of territorial experts" (p. 161). There are also contradictions apparent between the chapter on Constantinople and the Balkans, by Dr. Bowman, and that on the Armenian Problem and the Disruption of Turkey, by Professor Westermann. Both of these are particularly interesting and able discussions, but Dr. Bowman writes as skeptic and realist while Professor Westermann writes as a disappointed enthusiast and idealist. In spite of such overlapping, the incompleteness of the record is evident from the fact that Shantung is nowhere mentioned.

The volume is therefore very far from being in any sense a history of the Conference and it was doubtless not so intended by the individual contributors. It is valuable as giving the attitude of American delegates and their impressions of the Conference shortly after the events. Since discussion almost everywhere centres on the American attitude, and of necessity slights the claims of other nations involved, it is unfortunate that Colonel House and Professor Seymour should have chosen the title *What Really Happened at Paris*. The contents of the volume would have been more truly denoted had it been called "The Case of the United States at the Peace Conference".

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

Russia Today and Tomorrow. By PAUL N. MILIUKOV. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xii, 392. \$2.25.)

THIS new volume of Professor Miliukov is the result of a series of lectures, delivered in America in the autumn of 1921, at the Lowell Institute in Boston, Columbia University in New York, the Civic Forum of New York, and the Western Reserve University in Cleveland. Since the lectures were delivered at so many different places there is a certain lack of continuity in the volume, which makes it somewhat inferior to Miliukov's first American book. *Russia and its Crisis* has long ago become a classic of Russian history, both in Europe and the United States. The historical value of *Russia Today and Tomorrow* is due chiefly to the importance of contemporary events, and to the testimony of a man who took a prominent personal part in the revolutionary months of 1917.

The first two chapters, Why the Revolution could not be Averted and Why the Bolsheviks got the Upper Hand, are a brief summary of the historical foundation of the Revolution; the American reader will find a much more detailed explanation of the revolutionary movement in *Russia and its Crisis* and in Masaryk's volumes *The Spirit of Russia*. In chapters II. and III. the author tries to explain the main

principles of Bolshevism, giving also the reasons why these new ideas got such a firm hold on the Russian people in 1917 and 1918; much of this is already well known to the reading public of the West.

Chapter IV. is devoted to the rôle played during the Revolution by the many different non-Slavic nationalities of the former empire of the tsars; there are some very valuable parts in it, especially concerning the Baltic states, the Caucasus, and the Ukraine; historians will find here a plausible explanation of the Russian point of view, in particular toward the Little Russian question. Chapter V. is somewhat disappointing; Miliukov endeavors to sketch in it the Foreign Policy of the Bolshevik Government, but lays far too much stress on one point only, namely, the Bolshevik idea of a world-revolution; that it played a great rôle in the Bolshevik policy in general can hardly be doubted, but one has good reason to think that the Bolshevik leaders have faith in it some time ago.

The two following chapters, VI. and VII., dealing with the history of the anti-Bolshevik movements and of the decline of Bolshevism, are really the most valuable and interesting part of the volume. The author gives a detailed and impartial account of the events of these last years and explains clearly the reasons for failure and disappointment, emphasizing the liberal and progressive Russian point of view. Every impartial historian of the Bolshevik régime must carefully study Miliukov's analysis, even if some of his conclusions may seem questionable; these chapters give the volume permanent scientific historical value.

In chapter VIII., Miliukov endeavors to explain the causes of the terrible famine of 1921-1922, rightly pointing out the faults and mistakes of the Bolsheviks. Chapter IX. is a sketch of future possibilities in Russia, as seen by a thorough liberal. Chapter X., on the other hand, is devoted to the Far Eastern question and was inspired by the proceedings of the Washington Conference. The author shows how much Russia suffers from the constant baneful interference of Japan, citing very valuable proofs concerning the recent events in Siberia and the situation in the Russian Far East; some of the facts mentioned in the book relating to Japanese exploitation and selfishness are really appalling and have a great historical value, explaining many of the recent happenings in Eastern Siberia.

The last chapter, XI., deals with Russia's contribution to the world's civilization. It is far too brief to cover the whole field and leaves an impression of hurried work and superficiality; it could have been omitted without much harm done to the rest of the volume. The English style is not equal to that of his former work. Nevertheless the book of Miliukov will unquestionably retain its historical interest for a very long while.

S. A. KORFF.

A History of the Arabs in the Sudan and some Account of the People who preceded them and of the Tribes inhabiting Dárfūr.
By H. A. MACMICHAEL, D.S.O., Sudan Political Service. In two volumes. (Cambridge: University Press. 1922. Pp. xxii, 347; viii, 488. 90 s.)

THIS book is far more interesting and important to students of history in general than its title would suggest. For them the primitive Arab tribes and their settlement in the Sudan are a back-water and although the migrations of the peoples are always significant, yet this was not one of the great treks of history. But the problems of history and its methods and difficulties are everywhere the same and it is the great merit of this book that it is so suggestive and illuminating for some of these. What, for example, is the value of the genealogical information furnished by family tradition? That question confronts us all, from the exegete of the Old Testament to the authority on *Mayflower* descent. Again, if such information cannot give us ironclad and exact "trees", can it be allowed the value of "a genealogical parable" in Mr. MacMichael's happy phrase? That is the direction in which the Old Testament student has long been drifting and he especially will find in these volumes many most significant analyses and parallels in very full detail—this ordered mass of detail is one of the great strengths of the book. By no single word does Mr. MacMichael suggest this possible application of his researches, but great blocks of the illustrative documents he quotes could be rendered straight into the language of Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. And it must be admitted that a net result of the whole analogy of these often quite modern Arabic traditional documents is to assign a higher real, if "parabolic", historical value to the sister genealogies and historical statements of the Old Testament. And the same analogy will hold with other historical fields.

So much as *captatio benevolentiae* for an out-of-the-way book. It consists of four parts: (i) The ethnological characteristics of the inhabitants of the northern Sudan before the coming of the Arabs as Muslims. Besides the non-Arab races, this includes the Arab filtration across the Red Sea and through Egypt from the earliest times. (ii) The Arab tribes in medieval Egypt and how they worked their way beyond into the Sudan. This involves a statement of the genealogical relationships of these tribes in Arabia itself; but is also historical for Egypt and the Sudan. (iii) A detailed and objective classified statement of the Sudanese Arab tribes, genealogical group by group, at the present day. This takes up almost half of the first volume. (iv) The whole of the second and larger volume is entitled "The Native Manuscripts of the Sudan", and contains the rough material out of which a Hexateuch might have been worked up in native hands. Mr. MacMichael has rightly given these, thirty-three in all, as they came to him, in translations with com-

mentaries, genealogical tables, and considerable extracts from the original Arabic texts. The value of this mass of documents, so elucidated, for the student of the history of North Africa, or of historical possibilities and methods generally, cannot easily be overestimated. One broad result is worth stating. The genealogies reckon about forty generations from the Muslim era to the present day. Of these the last five or six may be generally accepted as stated accurately—so far family tradition holds; the next eight or nine are less accurate; then come “seven or eight successive ancestors whose names rest more firmly on the accepted authority of contemporary ‘trees’ compiled during that Augustan age of the Sudan, the period of the early Fung Kingdom”; beyond these are some fourteen or fifteen weak links probably invented in part by genealogists of the Fung period; these join, and were meant to join, to the first thoroughly historical and accepted descents from the Companions of the Prophet. This is a very illuminative result and suggests caution in too wholesale rejection of long pedigrees.

The materials in these volumes for ethnology and folk-lore are at least equally important. On these subjects the author has already made his mark. The only possible criticism of the whole result of his labors is that it would have been well if he had collaborated in the final revision with a student of Islam and of the Arabic language and literature. This throws no discredit on his own knowledge of Sudanese Arabic, which is evidently far better for his purposes than any mere reader of literary Arabic could reach, but such collaboration would have secured due correlation between what Arabists already know and this new information. We are told here many things we know already and some things that are not so, and we are not told some things we want to know, like the persistent use of *walad* for *ibn* and of such forms as *Muhammadāb*. We should like to know also whether the frequent variation, especially in vowels, from the literary form of names is a reproduction of Sudanese pronunciation. The notes, too, often show more accurate knowledge in Arabic matters than the translations to which they are attached. Apparently there was some later revision and completion.

D. B. MACDONALD.

India Old and New. By Sir VALENTINE CHIROL. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1921. Pp. x, 319. 10s.)

It is doubtful whether any living person, possessed of equal literary ability, knows as much about India and its political history during the last generation as the author of this volume. He has at least interviewed, if he has not become the trusted friend of, nearly every actor in the great political drama which has been rapidly unfolding for the last twenty years in India. Those who took the initiative in the movement which led to the enactment of the Government of India Act of

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—9.

1919 took counsel with him and were greatly influenced by his views. Gokale, the greatest statesman India has produced, was Sir Valentine's friend, while the agitators Tilak and Gandhi have discussed at length with him the burning questions of India's political life. All this and his mastery of the historical and political literature of India have made Sir Valentine Chisol the writer most worth reading on this subject. Radical Indians bitterly criticize his lack of sympathy with Indian aspirations, but the moderates recognize in him a true friend of India.

The rapidity with which Indian affairs are moving is amazingly proven by the fact that the leaves of the author's book on *Indian Unrest* were hardly dry from the press, when he realized the need for this new book, and, now that it is published, one familiar with recent developments realizes that still another volume is necessary to place one abreast of this swift-moving political evolution.

The historical background of the present political unrest is admirably sketched in the first five or six chapters. The clash of the two civilizations, the Indian and the European, is drawn with a fine feeling for the essentials. There follows a masterly chapter on the enduring power of Hinduism, which emphasizes the two salient features of Indian history up to the time of the Moslem invasion, the failure of the Aryan Hindus to achieve any permanent form of political unity, and their success, nevertheless, in building on rock foundations a complex but vital social system, Hinduism. When the Mahomedan flood in the eleventh century began to flow down into India and wave succeeded wave for three centuries, the plunder and carnage and cruelty and lust failed to destroy Hinduism, "because it consisted of such an infinity of water-tight compartments each vital and self-sufficing", and never breaking up, though almost submerged by the waves. The succeeding Mogul dynasty, from Timur to Akbar and Aurangzeb, again found that Hinduism would bend without breaking to the storm. With no political independence Hindu life and manners remained. Then came the British traders, and in time the traders became administrators and rulers, and once British power was fully established India enjoyed peace more universal and enduring than through all the ages of her troubled past. The author traces the growing British sense of responsibility toward the alien races which they ruled, and points out that as early as 1824 Sir Thomas Munro, governor of Madras, expressed the hope in a public document that "we shall in time so far improve the character of our Indian subjects as to enable them to govern and protect themselves". From that time on this spirit was never entirely absent, though often weak and too much subdued by Mammon. The chapter on the Mutiny and Fifty Years After makes clear the good and ill effect of that event on British administration, and "the first great wave of unrest" was in part at least the result. It is shown how British education bred radicals and discontented elements in Indian society,

Schlesinger: New Viewpoints in American History 131

which once created seized every opportunity that the government gave to raise opposition to it. The Morley-Minto reforms are ably analyzed and criticized, and their failure to satisfy Indian demands which grew apace with every concession to them. The last half of the book shows how the Great War led to the Indian Reforms Bill, and makes clear why these reforms were initiated under the most unfavorable circumstances. Perhaps no other person could have told with such sympathy the story of Mr. Gandhi's fight against the introduction of these reforms, the elections which preceded the birth of an Indian Parliament, and the difficulties in its path. The concluding chapters on the economic factors and the Indian problem as a world problem are very suggestive. On the whole few men can write of contemporary history with as great impartiality as Sir Valentine Chirol.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

New Viewpoints in American History. By ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER, Professor of History in the University of Iowa. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xi, 299. \$2.40.)

PROFESSOR SCHLESINGER purposed in his heart "to bring together and summarize, in non-technical language, some of the results of the researches of the present era of historical study". He succeeded admirably, even to the "non-technical language". His story flows easily, smoothly, with here and there a refreshing eddy of humor, as, for example, his likening of the two great parties to "two armies that have been sitting opposite each other for so long a time that they have forgotten the original cause of their quarrel".

As the author suggests in his "Foreword", most of his chapters deal with viewpoints not new to historical scholars. On geographic factors he follows Semple, Brigham, and others; on the influence of the frontier, Turner and Paxson; on economic influences, Beard and his confederates. In the chapter on the American Revolution he has an easy mastery due to his own valuable contribution to the study of that period, and to the work of such scholars as Andrews, Osgood, and Beer. While these chapters deal with facts and viewpoints familiar to most historical scholars, the author's summaries and interpretations will be suggestive to his professional confrères, and of much enlightenment to the general reader.

Fresher to the hardened historian are the chapters on the Rôle of Women, the State Rights Fetish, the Foundations of the Modern Era, and the Riddle of the Parties.

The most resonant and recurring note in the volume is that of economic influences, whether in the Revolution, the making of the Constitution, the Jacksonian period, or the "Modern Era". He does

not blink the facts nor the portents. Yet this is no doctrinaire history, no marshalling of hand-picked data for an Armageddon of social forces. He has come through the fires of economic determinism with even temper. He can discern some good in both conservatives and radicals—and some bad (p. 108). He seems to be a progressive with one foot on the brake-pedal.

The book is hard to find fault with, but reviewers must try. In his chapter on Geographic Factors, an interesting section might have been added on soil and climatic influences, as propounded by Ellsworth Huntington and others of the newer school of geographers. American isolation has not merely "ceased to exist" (p. 29), but never did exist. The fact that by the Constitution "the separate states were permitted to continue to restrict the franchise as they chose" is unconvincing evidence of an attempt by aristocrats to "keep the plain people in a subordinate place" (p. 81). In the Federal Convention that section of the Constitution (Art. I., sec. 2 of the final draft) was defended in the name of popular government, and adopted in the face of opposition from the "aristocrats" who wished to restrict the franchise to freeholders. (See Farrand, *Records of Federal Convention*, II. 201-206.) In the light of the Convention debates, and of the later history of the franchise, it would be fairer to say that the separate states were left free to enlarge the franchise as they chose.

These are not serious criticisms. The critic's sickle cut a meagre harvest—only enough to emphasize the general reliability and sanity of the book.

The chapter bibliographies are good above the ordinary. They are crisp, critical essays on recent tendencies in American historical research and writing. The index is very full, covering even the bibliographies. Blessed are the indexers!

R. W. KELSEY.

George Bryan and the Constitution of Pennsylvania, 1731-1791. By BURTON ALVA KONKLE. (Philadelphia: William J. Campbell. 1922. Pp. viii, 381. \$4.00.)

PENNSYLVANIA has been fortunate in her historians. Among others Sharpless, Shepherd, Watson, and Westcott have pictured different phases of her history, all helpful to those who would understand the Quaker Colony, and Mr. Konkle, in his trilogy comprising the lives of David Lloyd, George Bryan, and James Wilson, has well supplemented the work of his predecessors. Biography seems to appeal to the author and it has given a vigor to his words which a less personal record would hardly furnish. No careful reader can fail to see the importance of George Bryan to the colony of his adoption; the danger is that the hasty reader will neglect the no less vital influence exercised by his fellow-citizens, great and small, or disregard the close connection be-

tween Pennsylvania and the outside world in making and applying the constitution of 1776.

The author prefaces his study with a chapter upon the services of David Lloyd, who laid the foundation upon which Bryan built. The ancestry and youth of the latter, as well as conditions in Pennsylvania before his arrival from Ireland in 1752, are outlined in the next ten pages, after which Mr. Konkle measures the importance of the newcomer in the field already occupied by Franklin, Galloway, Morris, Willing, and Dickinson.

Six chapters narrate the growing influence in local matters of the Irish-Pennsylvanian at the expense of Franklin, who "became less a leader in the province and more of an intercolonial leader". The contestants for supremacy were not decreased in number, as by 1773 James Wilson had won a place as the "greatest lawyer outside of Philadelphia" and gradually became recognized as a worthy successor of Franklin himself. Dickinson, who had been Wilson's instructor, was well qualified by his London education to supply "a profound philosophical conception of the principles of British liberty", and with the gathering of the Constitutional Convention of 1776 there ensued a conflict of men and ideals hardly equalled in another colony in America. The result was a reconstruction of almost everything in Pennsylvania.

Space is lacking to describe the political, racial, and religious divisions which had to be harmonized if a contented people was to result from the reconstruction. Mr. Konkle "glances at the characteristics of Pennsylvania leadership", outlines the differences among the population to be led, and in the next hundred pages shows how the royal and proprietary authority under the earlier constitution came into the hands of the commons guided by Merchant, Judge, and President Bryan. The varied plans for government presented in the convention and the decade following are carefully considered, particular attention being given to the conflict for control between the advocates of a single and a bicameral legislature. Bryan supported the former theory and, aided by the example of the Continental Congress, defeated the friends of an additional chamber. To him a second body seemed a continuance of proprietary influence or the establishment of an aristocracy, and it was not until this fear had subsided that James Wilson could replace the dominant commons by an equal senate and house.

Bryan's work upon the bench and in the more general field of legal legislation is next described, followed by an account of the aid which he gave to education, especially in promoting union between the College of Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania. The volume recognizes the efforts of Bryan the abolitionist and pays him a tribute as the originator of anti-slavery legislation in the United States worthy to rank with Garrison and Lincoln. The biography has twenty-three

appropriate illustrations and a fair index of fifteen pages, although the latter is hardly adequate as a guide to all the information contained in Mr. Konkle's elaborate book.

CHARLES H. LINCOLN.

The Supreme Court in United States History. In three volumes. 1789-1821; 1821-1855; 1856-1918. By CHARLES WARREN, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1922. Pp. xvi, 540; x, 551; x, 532. \$18.00.)

THE two works with which Mr. Warren's is most apt to be compared are Carson's *History of the Supreme Court* and Beveridge's *Life of John Marshall*. The former is a recital of decisions interlarded with short biographies of the judges, and while Mr. Warren furnishes brief statements both of the facts involved and of the decisions reached in the cases of which he treats, his book is not otherwise tangent to the earlier work. With Beveridge's *Life* there is a more obvious overlapping for the period of Marshall's incumbency, to which Mr. Warren devotes two-thirds of his first volume and one-half of the second; but this seems to have been the unavoidable result of the synchronous preparation of parallel works, and besides the method of treatment of the same material is usually very divergent.

Probably two-thirds of Mr. Warren's book consists of matter which is quoted directly or indirectly—and most of it directly. It is his purpose to preserve contemporary impressions of the court in daily action, contemporary accounts of the famous arguments before it, contemporary political gossip regarding appointments or suggested appointments to its membership, and above all contemporary comments, both the hostile and the friendly, of its principal decisions, most of which of course lay in the field of constitutional interpretation. In the performance of this task he has combed sources of every kind, newspapers, magazines, the biographies and writings of public men, to say nothing of the numerous manuscript collections which he has laid under contribution. Nor is even this the full toll of his researches. For his own observations, as well as his citations, show him fully abreast with the recent "literature" dealing with the critical phases of his subject, whether in the form of books or articles in periodicals.

The result is a work of great interest and value not only to bench and bar and to special students of constitutional law and theory, but to all students of public opinion in democracies, and especially the American democracy. Nowhere else can such a wealth of material be found bearing on the issues which at various times have been raised with reference to the institution of judicial review of legislative acts. In these pages we see how from the first the discussion of measures, and even of men, was constricted by the doctrine of constitutional

limitations into a peculiar vocabulary in which questions of public policy assumed automatically the guise of questions of individual rights. By the same sign we see the highest judicial tribunal of the country for the determination of individual rights subjected almost without intermission to the fiercest tempests of partizan and sectional rage and to every verbal brutality of denunciation. Yet the final impression conveyed is by no means unfavorable to the characteristic feature of our system of government. If it is granted that there are certain fundamental understandings which demand embodiment in a written constitution, it must be further granted that this constitution must have a final authorized interpreter; nor will anybody be apt to turn from Mr. Warren's pages, with their graphic record of the wild inconsistencies with which sections, parties, and individuals have at different times essayed the task of constitutional construction, without feeling that had this final authorized interpreter been any organ of government except the Supreme Court, the Constitution must have been torn to shreds and tatters within a generation.

In short, as compared with the violent fluctuations of public opinion as regards the crucial topics of constitutional doctrine, the Supreme Court will be found to have pursued a remarkably steady and consistent course. The fact offers striking confirmation to the so-called "mechanical theory" of judicial interpretation; given a sufficiently large and representative bench of judges, sufficiently withdrawn from the hazards of politics, and it will in the long run identify itself as the still, small voice of the law amid the babble of opinion about it. It is interesting, moreover, to see how easily and with what grace the vast majority of appointees to the court—some of them the mere wheel-horses of party—have yielded themselves to this theory and the dignifying tradition of office which it supports.

Some incorrigibles there have been, like McLean, whose perpetual candidacy for the presidency precipitated at last the calamitous Dred Scott decision, and Chase, whose similar pre-occupation was more or less responsible for the imbecility of *Hepburn v. Griswold*; but on the whole, judges with a political itch—once they became judges—have been rare.

The two principal criticisms of Mr. Warren's book are, first, that it is too long; and, secondly, that it is not long enough. Save for a perfunctory chapter or two, the work ends with the close of Waite's chief-justiceship, in other words, just as the problems of constitutional construction with which we are concerned to-day began to arise. For this omission he offers the double apology that this recent period is still within the view of living men and that the historical perspective is still lacking; but both are of transitory validity, wherefore it is to be hoped that eventually he may incorporate in a fourth volume recent criticism of the court—that criticism which is so dominated by the

strident voice of Mr. Samuel Gompers. On the other hand, a little freer use of foot-notes would often have relieved the text of a certain oppressive repetitiousness without, at the same time, sacrificing anything of the satisfying completeness of the work as a survey of opinion.

Mr. Warren's efforts to correct accepted historical verdicts are not always convincingly successful, but otherwise the work is singularly free of statements to which the informed reader will be apt to take exception. He shows, in correction of Beveridge, that the decision in *Marbury v. Madison* was widely published at the time (I. 245, note 2); yet Judge Davis knew nothing of it five years later (*ibid.*, 345, note 2). He insists that the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions did not imply a repudiation of the right of the court to pass upon the constitutionality of acts of Congress—though the Northern legislatures so interpreted them—but only a supplementary right in the states to reject acts which the court had sustained against the constitutional objection (*ibid.*, 258–261). Even so, in rejecting the *finality* of the court's decisions, they introduced a vastly different idea of judicial review from that stated in the *Federalist*; while, moreover, some of the supporters of the Resolutions, Breckenridge of Kentucky, for instance, later came out against judicial review of Congressional acts in any form; nor do the words which Mr. Warren quotes from the closing pages of Madison's *Report* of 1799 prove more than that the author of them had discovered in discretion the better part of valor. Also, Mr. Warren's contention, based on a letter of Taney's, that Jackson "never asserted a right to decline to carry out a court decision, when acting in his executive capacity" (II. 222–224; *cf.* 246), is, in view of all the facts, entirely unpersuasive. Hailing as he does from Boston, Mr. Warren champions Webster's claim that Marshall's opinion in *Gibbons v. Ogden* "followed closely the track of his argument" (*ibid.*, 70–71), but the fact is that this characteristically vainglorious assertion is without basis; nor should Goodrich's recollections of what the great Daniel said in the Dartmouth College case have been cited as reliable historical testimony (I. 479, note 2). Mr. Warren is also mistaken in supposing that the passage which he quotes from the original opinion of the court in *Kendall v. United States* does not appear in the printed report (II. 320; *cf.* 12 Peters, 524). Occasionally it is the lawyer who speaks in these pages, with the lawyer's tendency to "antedate the emergence of ideas" (see, *e.g.*, I. 476 and note); and occasionally the profitless inclination is indulged to conjecture what would have happened if something else had happened which didn't (*e.g.*, I. 410, 413).

But these, after all, are very minor blemishes of a highly valuable work. It should be added that the publishers have done their part most satisfactorily, even to the excellent index.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

Training for the Public Profession of the Law: Historical Development and Principal Contemporary Problems of Legal Education in the United States, with some account of Conditions in England and Canada. By ALFRED ZANTZINGER REED. [Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Bulletin Number Fifteen.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1921. Pp. xviii, 498. \$2.00.)

PREVIOUS books on legal education relate primarily to one institution, like the *Centennial History of the Harvard Law School*, 1918, or Warren's *History* of that School, 1908 (although containing much general bibliographical material); or discuss pedagogical problems, like the earlier Carnegie Bulletin by Redlich on the Case Method, 1914. Reed covers all law schools and office-training, approaching education from the fresh viewpoint of its relation to requirements for admission to the bar.

The introductory part I. discusses Comparative Development of Law and the Legal Profession in England, Canada, and the United States, and summarizes the whole book. The American lawyer is shown to be an outgrowth of the English solicitor, and our law schools to resemble the English training by lawyers, not the Continental universities. The historian will find his chief interest in parts II.-V. These survey exhaustively the early requirements for admission to the bar (II.); the rise of law schools (III.); the rise of bar associations after the Civil War (IV.); and the changes in bar-admission requirements due to law schools and bar associations (V.). Part VI. covers the broadening of the curriculum after the Civil War; VII., the intensification of training by written examinations, the case method, etc. Part VIII. on recent developments is anticipatory of a subsequent Carnegie Bulletin on the contemporary situation. The author's principal recommendation for a division of the bar into graduates of leading law schools, organized into selective bar associations, which will also admit other conspicuously able practitioners, and secondly into graduates of text-book and night schools, has been vigorously attacked by Albert M. Kales.¹

Legal education touches general American history at many points. Jeffersonian democracy resented the prevalence of Federalist lawyers suspected of a monopoly, and almost abolished bar-admission requirements. Jefferson insisted on sound Republican law professors for the University of Virginia, while Northern schools selected Federalists (pp. 119, 140). In protest against Calhoun's doctrine of state rights, Dane endowed a Harvard professorship to teach law "equally in force in all branches of our Federal Republic" (p. 143). Reed establishes a parallelism between stiffened bar admission and civil-service reform (pp. 41, 42, 102). The absence of law-school courses on government

¹ *Harvard Law Rev.*, XXXV. 96; and Reed's reply, *ibid.*, 355.

and economics (such as in France) has deprived our lawyer leaders of the opportunity for careful study of the mechanism confided to their charge (p. 296).

This assemblage at enormous labor of a mass of valuable data from widely scattered sources would hardly have been financed by an author, and demonstrates the usefulness of educational foundations. The book is, however, very hard reading. The reader jumps from state to state with bewildering frequency. Perhaps the multitude of states made this inevitable, but the interest would be far greater if the text had been limited to the opinions and rules about admission to the bar in two or three leading jurisdictions, with the others relegated to foot-notes. This might have made room among dates and statistics for more contemporaneous human touches, like Jefferson's denunciation of Virginia country lawyers as "an inundation of insects" (p. 404); or an early radical's view that lawyers should be as free from educational restrictions as doctors and clergymen—"A man's property is no better than his life or his soul" (p. 89); or the success of the early Litchfield, Connecticut, law school because of the presence of a girls' boarding-school, whose head informed an entering legal scholar, "The young ladies all marry law students" (p. 130).

Finally, excellent as Reed is on the external relations of the law schools to the bar, the fact, avowed with attractive frankness, that he is not a lawyer handicaps his discussion of their internal problems and of the law. Witness his questionable distinction between the case-method schools teaching the law as it ought to be and text-book schools showing better what it is (pp. 292, 385), his statement that the overruling of precedents first became noteworthy after the Civil War (p. 347), the analysis of the origins of American law (pp. 30-34). That our law has by no means "split off" (p. 33) from contemporary English decisions is exemplified by Chief Justice Taft's recent use of the House of Lords Taff Vale case in his Coronado labor decision. The association of a legal scholar with Mr. Reed would strengthen the forthcoming Bulletin on the contemporary situation.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

Papers of the San Francisco Committee of Vigilance of 1851. III. Minutes and Miscellaneous Papers; Financial Accounts and Vouchers. Edited by MARY FLOYD WILLIAMS. [Publications of the Academy of Pacific Coast History, vol. IV.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1919. Pp. xvi, 906.)

History of the San Francisco Committee of Vigilance of 1851: a Study of Social Control on the California Frontier in the Days of the Gold Rush. By MARY FLOYD WILLIAMS, Ph.D. [University of California Publications in History, vol. XII.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1921. Pp. xii, 543. \$5.00.)

EVERY investigator who has had occasion to consult H. H. Bancroft's *Popular Tribunals*, only to be more or less disappointed, will welcome this publication of the records of the Committee of Vigilance of 1851. As explained in an introductory note by the late Professor H. Morse Stephens, from the time that the Bancroft Collection came into the possession of the University of California in 1906 it was desired to publish the documents: "Not only were the papers themselves of surpassing interest as exhibiting a phase of frontier life under unexampled conditions, but they corrected widespread misrepresentations of early life in California" (p. iii). Parts I. and II., edited by Porter Garnett, were printed in 1910 and 1911, respectively (Academy of Pacific Coast History, *Publications*, vol. I., no. 7, and vol. II., no. 2). In 1913 Miss Mary Floyd Williams was induced by Professor Stephens to edit the remaining papers, in connection with her graduate studies at the University of California. Those in position to give assistance cordially co-operated with her, with the result that the volume of *Papers* gives ample evidence of careful editorship.

The records are published in chronological order and would be somewhat perplexing to the reader were it not for the minute analysis which has been made in the index and the addition of relevant appendixes and helpful foot-notes and cross-references. Contemporary newspapers and other sources have been consulted to explain allusions otherwise obscure. Since the public archives of San Francisco have been destroyed by fire, these papers constitute the chief record of the thought and conditions of life of an important period in the history of the city. It is a remarkably complete record of its kind, due to the fact that the president of the executive committee felt "a deep solicitude in the careful preservation of these documents" (Report on Prisoners, September 15, 1851, p. 639) and to the continuous service of a methodical and devoted secretary. "Merchants whose fortunes often turned on the chance of a single day, sat hour after hour at the bare table in the 'Executive Chamber' writing laborious, verbatim reports of the examinations and statements that fill the hundreds of pages preserved in the archives of the association" (editor's note, pp. x-xi).

The constitution of the Committee of Vigilance as "instituted the 8th of June 1851" is given in full. The minutes and miscellaneous papers cover nearly seven hundred and fifty pages of the volume, and the financial accounts and vouchers require fifty more pages. The appendixes include a list of the members of the committee, officers, and standing committees, record of attendance at meetings of the executive committee, analysis of the financial accounts, prisoners arrested by the Committee of Vigilance with a record of the disposition that was made of them, and a list of the criminals implicated by James Stuart and his confederates. The volume is illustrated by a map of San Francisco in 1851, facsimiles of certificate of membership, minutes of a general

meeting, etc.; also by a photograph of the banner presented to the Committee of Vigilance by the ladies of Trinity Church "As a Testimonial of their Approbation—Do Right and Fear Not".

The *History of the San Francisco Committee of Vigilance of 1851*, of which Miss Williams is the author, is designed to accompany the *Papers* and is based upon them, but is complete in itself. It is an effort to interpret their meaning in the light of an understanding of the social and political conditions of the time. The author's point of view differs very materially from that presented in the writings of Shinn, Royce, Bancroft, and others. In part I. she sets forth the chaotic conditions of the California frontier from 1848 to 1851. Part II. contains a careful study of the events in San Francisco which led to the organization of the Committee of Vigilance, followed by an analysis in detail of the work of the committee as revealed in the *Papers* and checked by an examination of newspaper files and other sources of information.

The author discusses the difficult problem of determining what influence the committee exerted toward the restraint of crime and the improvement of society. She finds some evidence which indicates that "the immediate result was a diminution of crime that deserves respectful attention" (p. 390). Lasting reforms in local politics or in local courts were not effected, however, although men who led among the Vigilantes were also leaders in other forms of civic activity (p. 392).

Miss Williams devotes a chapter to lynch law as a national problem, placing the California vigilance committees in their historical setting and deprecating the slowness with which we are developing in this country through our democratic institutions an effective legalized means of social control.

Much detailed work is required in a study of this nature and there is abundant evidence in these volumes of the author's perseverance and thoroughness. She has shown good judgment in handling her material. Both volumes have the earmarks of sound scholarship based on research. A few more or less obvious errors have been noted, chiefly typographical. Her work is a contribution of permanent value to the history of lynching as practised in the western part of the United States. The carefully edited *Papers* are also a reliable source of information on other matters of historical and sociological interest.

J. E. CUTLER.

The Life of Clara Barton, Founder of the American Red Cross. By WILLIAM E. BARTON. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1922. Pp. xvi, 348; 388. \$10.00.)

THE definitive *Life of Clara Barton* fills two large volumes. It is properly so divided, for there are two stories. One is an *Ilias Malorum*, the story of the miseries and sufferings of a war—our Civil War—as

seen by this little school-teacher and department clerk of New England birth and nurture and as lightened by her womanly ministries, then so unusual in such "rough and unseemly positions", but now become the bright commonplace of war. The other is an Aeneid of her wanderings in other lands (after her physical post-war collapse), of incidental nursing adventures in the Franco-Prussian War, and of the founding of what through her official descendants has become an empire of mercy—the American Red Cross.

It is no Strachey portrait that a kinsman of Clara Barton has painted of this Florence Nightingale of America, whose life was almost exactly contemporaneous with that of Florence Nightingale; for the latter was born but a few months before Clara Barton and preceded her in death by about the same number of months, both being beyond ninety. The resemblances, as pointed out by Dr. Barton, are many. If Strachey had not made his sketch of Miss Nightingale, they would have been more marked, for Clara Barton was more like the traditional "Lady of the Lamp". Each, says Dr. Barton, protested to the end of her life that her real work was not that of the popular imagination, that of personally ministering to any considerable number of sick or wounded soldiers, but a work of direction and organization. But the first volume of the life of Clara Barton leaves the reader with a consciousness of her individual ministration, instead of a feeling that as an organizer she was fighting against principalities and powers, as did Florence Nightingale. Not that Clara Barton did not, as her English sister, have to contend with red tape and inefficiency and selfishness and prejudice. She was a patient, diplomatic, persistent, calm person, whose voice "lowered with anger" and had no store of vitriol—a person who got things done. Yet they seemed for the most part to be individual things, directly of her own doing or getting done. She seemed to be going "on her own". All this makes her story all the more dramatic and subjective. As late as the spring of 1864, she said in answer to those who asked her why she worked independently of the Sanitary and Christian commissions, that she began before the commissions had an existence and that such skill as she had acquired by practice (for she had no training) belonged to her "to use untrammelled". She might not be able to "work as efficiently" or "labor as happily" under the direction of those of less experience. This is the natural disposition of a forceful character, whom, as Dr. Barton says, "people sometimes found arbitrary, impatient and obstinate". The account of her own nursing experiences is of particular interest because of the contrast it presents to the highly organized service in the care and relief of the wounded in the World War—a service which she above all others initially made possible. The first volume becomes thus the preface to the great achievement of the second volume—the founding of the American Red Cross. But it has an added value because of the comments by a very intelligent observer on the stirring events and on the great mili-

tary and political figures of that day seen from a point of view from which no one else was permitted to look upon the great events and characters of that time.

The second volume, the Aeneid of her travels, of her lonely struggle for the founding of the Red Cross in America, of her patient endurance of the seemingly interminable official delay, of her final triumph, of the perils and trials of her success, of her peace programme for the Red Cross, of her broken-hearted retirement, and of her death on the eve of the "blazing forth" of the Red Cross in every community between the oceans—it is a heroic story told by one who has faithfully and brilliantly performed his duty as a literary executor and made a unique contribution to American history.

Railroads and Government: their Relations in the United States, 1910-1921. By FRANK HAIGH DIXON, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Princeton University. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1922. Pp. xvi, 384. \$2.25.)

WHILE Professor Dixon's book was written primarily for the use of teachers, and will serve well as a text-book on federal regulation of railroads from 1910 to 1921, it is intended also for the general reader. It should be widely read. Never before has it been so important that the electorate should have an intelligent conception of the fundamentals of the railroad problem. The author has made a real contribution to a subject of national interest. The book is written in lucid style and the vital points, succinctly stated, are accompanied by just enough of detail to make their application clear.

The volume is in three parts: (1) "Federal Regulation, 1910 to 1916"; (2) "The War Period"; and (3) "The Return to Private Ownership". The first part contains an excellent discussion of the 1910 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act and a good review of the short-lived Commerce Court. The second part deals mainly with the organization, achievements, and after-effects of the United States Railroad Administration. The concluding part contains an excellent summary of the legislation under which the railroads were restored to private operation and a new rule of rate-making was adopted.

The review of the 1910 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act and the discussion of the leading cases decided by the Commission from 1910 to 1918 are well written. For the war period, the author gives a good summary of the work of the Railroads' War Board, and he effectively summarizes the reasons why voluntary unification under private control had to give way to compulsory unification under federal control. The account of the period of governmental operation is well balanced and the controversial features are handled impartially. The author concludes, so far as the first year of federal control (1918) was concerned, that "while mistakes may have been made in operating policies, these are

more readily discernible now than they could have been at the time", and that "on the whole, the results were gratifying and the year must be regarded as a success". As to the year 1919, or the interim between the signing of the Armistice and the return of the roads to private control, Professor Dixon is more guarded in expressing opinions. The results were not as satisfactory as those of the first year, but they may be excused because the Railroad Administration "was engaged in the thankless task of holding the properties together until the day of official dissolution".

The chapters which deal with labor relations, both under private control and federal operation, are particularly illuminating. The author displays an intimate knowledge of the ramifications of the labor problem and is fearless in expressing his personal views in criticism of certain policies adopted during federal control. "A careful survey of the last year of federal operation reflects little glory upon its handling of the labor situation in its broad national aspects."

The concluding part of the book contains an excellent summary of the Transportation Act of 1920, and in the last chapter the author suggests "a line of development which seems to promise for the years immediately ahead the most satisfactory outcome". That line of development is based upon the acceptance of four principles: (1) Railroads under private operation cannot be operated successfully without earnings sufficient to attract new capital; the rate of return upon property value should not be less than six per cent.; (2) if six per cent. cannot be earned, government aid must be sought, and that will mean ultimate government ownership; (3) under present rates and operating conditions there can be no assurance that six per cent. can be earned continuously, and as higher rates are inadvisable, the necessary earnings must be assured through the development, on a national scale, of a programme of efficient and economical operation; and (4) the results cannot be attained by any of the minor economies frequently suggested and practised—they must come through a nation-wide introduction of methods of co-operation.

Professor Dixon's long connection with transportation, both as a teacher and, for several years before the war, as chief statistician of the Bureau of Railway Economics, has enabled him to write authoritatively and with confidence. He has presented an admirable history of railroads, from the viewpoint of governmental regulation, during the critical period since 1910.

WILLIAM J. CUNNINGHAM.

MINOR NOTICES

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fourth series, volume IV. (London, the Society, 1921, pp. 258.) Sir Charles Oman's presidential address, with which this volume of the *Transactions* opens, is an

entertaining, but not more than entertaining, discourse on Some Medieval Conceptions of Ancient History. Of the seven other papers embraced in the volume, the most valuable are those of Miss Margaret L. Bazeley on the Extent of the English Forest in the Thirteenth Century, carefully worked out, with maps; of Miss Caroline A. J. Skeel on the short-lived Council of the West, established in 1539, respecting which she seems to have collected all the evidences; and of Professor Alexander Bugge of Christiania on the Norse Settlements in the British Islands. The society availed itself of Dr. Bugge's presence in England and lectures in All Souls' College, Oxford, to secure this expert and authoritative survey and pronouncement, based on full knowledge of the Scandinavian languages, on place-names, on inscriptions, and on the evidence of chronicles and documents. It will long be valued by students. In another paper, Rev. W. Hudson endeavors, by combination of Domesday evidence with that of a thirteenth-century survey of the manor of Martham in Norfolk, which he had already treated in the first volume of this series, to illustrate the status of *villani* and other tenants, in Danish East Anglia at least, in times before the Conquest. From Professor Joseph Redlich, of Vienna, there is a general description of the composition of the Austrian Haus-, Hof-, und Staats-archiv. The clerk of the records at the London Guildhall, Mr. A. H. Thomas, gives some illustrations of the medieval municipal history from those records, and Mr. F. W. X. Fincham, superintendent of the department of literary inquiry in the principal probate registry, gives some notes from the ecclesiastical records at Somerset House.

The History and Nature of International Relations. Edited by Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., Ph.D., Regent, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1922, pp. xi, 299, \$2.25.) This little book reproduces ten lectures on international relations that were delivered in Washington, D.C., to the general public and students of the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University during the winter and spring of 1920-1921. Although the lectures contain nothing new or strikingly original, they form a fairly consistent organic whole. This fact, together with the fact that the contributors are all men of distinction, and authorities in their respective fields, may be said to constitute a sufficient justification for the publication of the volume.

The only contribution for which any degree of novelty or originality, or even of scholarship in the academic sense, might be claimed is the thirty-page discussion of "International Relations in the Ancient World", by Professor M. I. Rostovtseff, formerly of the University of Petrograd. (This is not said by way of disparagement of the other contributors, who are all honorable men and whose contributions are all highly respectable, even if, as we may suspect, somewhat perfunctory in several instances.) The main novelty of this contribution by a Russian authority consists

in the return to an older and (as the reviewer considers it) outworn view that "the system of the modern European States is in no way a creation of the so-called middle ages", or that "the foundations of civilized life in modern Europe were laid during the classical period and the type of our European and American mentality was inherited by us from our classical predecessors" (p. 32). If the brief essay by Professor C. J. H. Hayes, "Medieval Diplomacy", presents fewer points of interest to one in search of originality and academic scholarship, it seems to furnish a much sounder and safer guidance to one in search of the truth.

If the reviewer were asked to award a prize on the score of brilliancy of treatment, he would unhesitatingly award it to Professor E. M. Borchard for the contribution entitled "The United States as a Factor in the Development of International Relations". And this in spite of the fact that he (the reviewer) feels himself obliged to dissent strongly from the lecturer's fundamental viewpoint and arguments in defense of our traditional policy of diplomatic isolation and aloofness. Here again we should consider the lecture by Hon. L. S. Rowe on "Latin America as a Factor in International Relations" a much safer and sounder guide.

Among the other contributions, "The Far East as a Factor in International Relations", by Hon. P. S. Reinsch, though all too brief, is perhaps the most noteworthy, especially in its insistence upon the non-political or personal and social character of the Chinese civilization.

It was hardly to be expected that there should be an index to a volume of this character, but various and more specific page-headings than the uniform and general one of "international relations" would have been highly convenient to the reader.

AMOS S. HERSHEY.

L'Empire Romain: Évolution et Décadence. By G. Bloch, Professeur Honoraire aux Universités de Lyon et de Paris. (Paris, Ernest Flammarion, 1922, pp. 313, 7.50 fr.) This, like its predecessor by the same author—*La République Romaine: les Conseils Politiques et Sociaux*—is one of a popular series, Le Bon's *Bibliothèque de Philosophie Scientifique*. This accounts for its cheap format, and must be taken into account in judging it. Being French, it is of course readable. Would that we had in English a book on the Roman Empire to compare with it in that regard! On the other hand, it contains nothing new, except some novel errors. Thus, we are told that the oath sworn to Octavianus by Rome and the western provinces before Actium was a *conjuratio* ("conspiracy"), a statement which at the time would have cost M. Bloch his head. He means, of course, a *sacramentum* (p. 12). Augustus's proconsular powers were not renewed every decennium (p. 17), but at intervals of five or ten years. The jurisdiction conferred on the procurators of Claudius is confounded with the *jus gladii* (p. 95). Agricola is referred to as "Agrippa" (p. 138). But much more serious than such slips—particularly in a book which professes, not to tell the

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—10.

history of the empire, but to give an account of its evolution—is M. Bloch's failure to understand the nature of the Augustan Principate. Augustus, according to him, was "un magistrat", "régulièrement investi de ses pouvoirs en vertu de sénatus-consultes" (p. 16). He was granted in 23 B.C. an *imperium proconsulare maius*, not only over the senatorial provinces (an idea which most historians, though not the reviewer, share), but over the city itself (pp. 22 ff.). "C'était là une grave innovation"; indeed, so great a one as to be incredible. As if this were not enough, however, M. Bloch invests Augustus in 18 B.C. with the *potestas consularis* for life (p. 31), on the basis, doubtless, of a statement of Dio's to which no one since Mommsen has given credence. Augustus's proconsular and tribunician powers together endowed him with criminal jurisdiction (p. 27). M. Bloch is thus estopped from telling the true story of the evolution of the Principate, the story of how the restored republican institutions failed to function, and the *Princeps* was permitted, or compelled by force of circumstances, to act *extra-legally*, until the constitutional authorities faded away and the monarchy took their place. M. Bloch's evident lack of training in Roman constitutional history unfits him for the task he has undertaken.

DONALD MCFAYDEN.

Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages. By Maurice De Wulf, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Louvain and in Harvard University. [Louis Clark Vanuxem Lectures for 1920.] (Princeton, University Press, 1922, pp. x, 313, \$3.00.) "The purpose of the study as here presented is to approach the Middle Ages from a new point of view, by showing how the thought of the period, metaphysics included, is intimately connected with the whole round of Western civilization to which it belongs." The author's intimate acquaintance with medieval philosophy, as shown in his *Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale* and in his various studies on the philosophers of the Low Countries, enables him to present the most satisfactory outline of scholasticism to be found in English. In the later chapters of the book the fundamental concepts of the thirteenth century and their relation to each other are set forth in the clearest manner. While emphasizing the symmetry and logical completeness of the scholastic system of thought, the author maintains a strict historical point of view, avoiding exaggerated praise and finding it "positively distressing to see historians, under the spell of special sympathies, proclaim the thirteenth century the best of all centuries of human history and prefer its institutions to our own".

In relating the philosophy of the Middle Ages to other aspects of its life, the author characterizes the twelfth century as one of differentiation and definition. Philosophy becomes distinct from theology, and the various fields of knowledge are classified and lines of demarcation drawn. Elsewhere, a similar movement seeks to define royal preroga-

tive, the rights of lords and vassals and bourgeoisie, the distinction between spiritual function and temporal charge in the Church, the establishment of artistic standards and the formation of types of architecture; while the metaphysical conception of the scholastics that "the only existing reality is individual reality" is in harmony with the feudal sense of personal worth. Above this work of definition and classification emerges the medieval tendency toward unity and the dream of universal harmony. This finds its full expression in the thirteenth century and is seen not only in the perfected system of scholastic philosophy but in the organization of new national states, of the papacy, of the friars; in the art of the Gothic cathedrals, a synthesis of all the beliefs and learning of the time; in Dante's *Divine Comedy* and Jacop de Voragine's *Golden Legend*; in the codification of the canon law.

In addition to these general connections between scholasticism and the civilization of the Middle Ages, Wulf examines the chief doctrines of that philosophy and shows their relation to the religious spirit of the time, to its ideas of the physical universe, to its social philosophy, its theories of the state, and its conception of human progress. The author's knowledge of historical details is not always equal to his understanding of the thought of the period and certain errors of fact are to be noted. But these do not invalidate his general conclusions, which will be found most suggestive and provocative of further thought.

A. C. HOWLAND.

The Public Records of Scotland. By J. Maitland Thomson, LL.D. (Glasgow, MacLehose, Jackson, and Company, 1922, pp. ix, 175, 10 s. 6 d.) The material contained in this volume formed substantially the Rhind Lectures delivered by Dr. Thomson in 1911. He confines his attention to records made by "recording authorities", and thus excludes chronicles, diaries, and such like.

In six chapters Dr. Thomson discusses the adventures of the public records of Scotland, the records of the Lord Clerk Register's Department, records of the Chancery, Treasury, and Household, the land registers, ecclesiastical records, and records not in charge of the Clerk Register. Each chapter deals carefully with its material, its nature and worth. Details are given of documents already published, and the references to those still in manuscript will stir up enthusiasm for historical research. The volume constitutes the best available short guide to the public records of Scotland, and it possesses an excellent index.

Dr. Thomson's pages abound in references to societies and historians, through whose labors much has been accomplished. The diversity of these activities suggests, however, the organization of some central body which by its personnel and attainments would command confidence in direction and advice. Dr. Thomson is doubtless right in looking for the present to local effort; and, with perhaps the most learned

ministry in the world, each manse in Scotland might easily become a centre of zeal. For public documents doubtless the present official services as outlined by the author will widen their activities which have already provided such magnificent guides for students, but local interest will always be needed to deal with the vast quantity of less official material. On the other hand, every historical student knows how frequently inexpert enthusiasm makes him almost wish that material had been left severely alone. It is in this connection that a central body of scholars, sufficiently small to avoid becoming another society and large enough to handle organization in historical activities, would be invaluable as an advisory council of research. It may well be, as was suggested, I think, at the opening of the School of Historical Research in London, that Scottish records in the possession of public authorities in England will be returned to Scotland; a magnificent opportunity would thus be provided for a thoroughly new national organization. As it is, Dr. Thomson's volume draws attention to so much unorganized material that he will secure the gratitude of all students if he is able to transfer some of his skilled industry to the creation of such an organization as will map out expert research.

W. P. M. KENNEDY.

Das Zeitalter der Normannen in Sizilien. Von Dr. Willy Cohn, Breslau. (Bonn and Leipzig, Kurt Schroeder, 1920, pp. 212, M. 10). One of the interesting publishers' enterprises in Germany since the War is the *Bücherei der Kultur und Geschichte* of the firm of Kurt Schroeder, a series of small manuals "for scholars, students, and laymen". According to the prospectus, they are to be prepared by scholars with scientific exactitude, yet printed in such a form as not to repel the educated general public. Dr. Cohn's *Zeitalter der Normannen in Sizilien* forms the sixth volume of this series. The period covered is that from the first landing of the Normans in southern Italy to the death of Tancred and the triumph of Henry VI. in 1194. The work is without notes; the text is compressed within some 190 pages; and there follow 21 closely packed pages of bibliography, in which sources and secondary works are run in together in alphabetical order without criticism. Since all critical apparatus has been excluded from the text, says the author, the bibliography has been made "as extensive as possible". Nevertheless, the volume is more attractive than this summary description indicates. The author does not claim that it makes any original contribution; but he has used the works of Caspar, Chalandon, and others to good advantage. The history of the southern Norman kingdom is well placed in the broader current of European affairs; and the outstanding characters and events of a stirring age and the salient features of a brilliant cosmopolitan civilization are seized upon with insight and vividly presented. The style is concise and lucid, and the

pages are not overcrowded; yet space is found for special chapters upon administration and legislation during the reign of Roger II.

C. W. DAVID.

France and England: their Relations in the Middle Ages and Now. By T. F. Tout, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., Professor of History and Director of Advanced Study in History. (Manchester, University Press, 1922, pp. viii, 168, \$2.50.) This little book is substantially a series of four lectures, delivered at the University of Rennes in 1921, on the identical or interwoven civilizations of the French and the English from the Conquest to the close of the Hundred Years' War. The lectures deal with race, language, literature, architecture, education, religion, law, administration, parliamentary institutions, the art of war, and much other culture material, skillfully woven into a text which marches and makes progress. Anyone who has a cursory acquaintance with medieval history will find them pleasant reading, and the specialist will also get hints and *aperçus* of value. The cosmopolitan outlook of Henry II. is particularly well characterized. He was "almost as little Norman or Angevin as he was English. He was rather the sublimation [*corr.*] of that cosmopolitan French-speaking type which was as much at home in one part of the western world as another" (p. 66). Stubbs is chided for underestimating the French element in English culture (pp. 96 ff.), Edward I. and Philip IV. are recognized as promoters of parliamentary institutions for equally selfish ends (p. 99), and the theory of a real *ecclesia Anglicana* in the Middle Ages is again dismissed (p. 110). The suggestion that the economic disorders and proletarian class-consciousness in Western Europe *circa* 1381 may have been due in part to the destruction of capital in the Franco-English war (p. 147) might well lead to useful research.

The aim of the lectures was the promotion of friendship between the French and the English of to-day. Would that medieval comradeships might really promote modern understandings! There is little relating to the present day in the book (pp. 152-162), but what there is is generally sound and is graciously said. A plea is made against the biassed history text-books of the two peoples (p. 162), which contribute their quota to mutual suspicion.

There are a very few contradictions and errors. The alliance of Burgundy with England was not treasonable to France (p. 15); yet it was a "national betrayal" (p. 139). John of Paris is erroneously lauded over Pierre Dubois for denying "the obligation of a universal realm" (p. 19). Dubois in the first part of *De Recuperatione* does that very thing. *Per contra* there is an index—an unexpected boon in an English book of this type. These lectures may be professedly a tract, but they are really first-rate history.

G. C. SELLERY.

Sainte Catherine de Sienne, Essai de Critique des Sources. I. Sources Hagiographiques, par Robert Fawtier, Docteur ès Lettres. [Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. CXXI.] (Paris, E. de Boccard, 1921, pp. xv, 245, 20 fr.) Is history a mere "thought-form"? The rueful question rises, as one solid tradition after another disappears before relentless critical study. The turn of the noble legend of Saint Catherine of Siena has long been overdue; and M. Fawtier, continuing the labors of Edmund Gardner, "le rénovateur des études catheriniennes" and others, is making the close examination to be desired. The present volume, discussing sources hagiographical and historical, is to be followed by one discussing the letters of the saint. It has long been obvious that in the mass of her correspondence, much is "scuola" writing or has been edited with special intent; and M. Fawtier's discrimination will be eagerly awaited. Meantime, this keen and careful first volume is welcome.

The results are in the main destructive. There was a Catherine, older at her death than is supposed; she lived in Siena and she went to Avignon. But the superb figure of the great stateswoman, counsellor of popes and kings, vanishes. Peace between Florence and the pope was never intrusted to her; she had nothing to do with persuading the pope to leave Avignon; her one political interest was the Crusade. Nor is her private life left intact. The most moving episode in her career, subject of a famous and beautiful letter, is her attendance on Niccolo Toldo, a young Perugian conspirator, on the scaffold. Alas! Niccolo was probably never executed; story and letter are mere puffs of mist.

What remains? It is too soon to say. But M. Fawtier seems to have established his contention, that the legend as we have it is a deliberate tendency-record, inspired by the ambition of the Dominicans, especially Raymund of Capua, to magnify the prestige of their saint.

We acquiesce: we are grateful for the author's acumen. We also remember the many cases in which the first results of scientific criticism are later modified, and early records find more credence than was at one point deemed possible. . . . It will be a long time before the last word is said about Catherine of Siena.

VIDA D. SCUDDER.

Histoire de Rome de 1354 à 1471. L'Antagonisme entre les Romains et le Saint-Siège. By E. Rodocanachi. (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1922, pp. viii, 520.) After his many studies during the last thirty years dealing with papal Rome the distinguished author was very properly moved to produce this ambitious volume covering the city's last medieval phase. His subtitle communicates the true purpose of the book, which, by its limitation to the municipal interests of the Eternal City, enters into rivalry less with Pastor than with Gregorovius. The abundant material, especially of an economic nature, which in recent years has seen the light, has made it possible to deal with facts and forces

necessarily concealed from writers of an earlier date, and particularly interesting as bringing Rome into line with the other Italian cities. What Rodocanachi has, above all, successfully brought out is that the Rome of the fourteenth century entered, with certain undeniable handicaps, into the commercial movement of the period and attempted, not without notable courage in the face of such a stubborn opponent as the papacy, to work out a system of republican liberty. Of course the effort failed when the end of the Great Schism brought the pope back to the Vatican in the enjoyment of steadily increasing revenues and commanding the services of professional troops. Probably no living scholar possesses an equally solid command of the material, both published and unpublished, dealing with the struggle and failure of the democratic movement in Rome, and certainly not Gregorovius himself maintained more consistently a tone of sympathetic interest coupled with judicial detachment. Inevitably the close pursuit of purely local affairs occasionally carries the reader into the tedious minutiae of a communal développement which, in spite of the glamor cast upon it by the world institution of the papacy, essentially lacks pith and substance, while the strictly chronological method adopted by the author produces some humdrum pages suggestive of the capricious movement of a medieval chronicle. Such defects are probably inherent in this form of study, the excellence of which will always be measured by the noteworthy evidence adduced and the sincerity of the author's craftsmanship. In both these respects Rodocanachi's work, which he would have us think of as a continuation of his *Cola di Rienzo*, maintains a high level.

FERDINAND SCHEVILL.

England under the Lancastrians. By Jessie H. Flemming, M.A. With a Preface by A. F. Pollard, Litt.D., F.B.A. [University of London Intermediate Source-Books of History, no. III.] (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1921, pp. xxi, 301, 12 s. 6 d.) "This, the third volume in the series of Intermediate Texts, links up the first, Miss Hughes' *Illustrations of Chaucer's England*, with the second, Miss Thornley's *England under the Yorkists*, and the three provide a continuous series of contemporary documents illustrating all aspects of English history, from the accession of Edward III. to that of Henry Tudor" (Preface). The general scheme of Miss Flemming's book is that of the preceding volumes,¹ the materials being arranged under these heads: Political (pp. 1-149), Constitutional (pp. 150-209), Ecclesiastical (pp. 210-240), Economic and Social (pp. 241-281). A short section is added on Ireland (pp. 282-288). Miss Flemming ends it and the book with an extract from *The Libel of English Policy*, written about

¹ *Amer. Hist. Review*, XXVI. (1921), pp. 569-570.

1436, which closes with these lines:

These seyde expensis gedred in one yere,
But in iij yere or iij gadred up here
Myght wynne Yrelonde to a fynalle conquest
In one soole yere, to sett us alle in reste.

The volume is drawn from a great variety of printed materials and in no small measure from unedited manuscripts. It is clear that the editor has designed not only to illustrate the standard themes but to introduce fresh illustrations. In this way she presents much unhackneyed matter for the meditations of students and also indicates the richness of the sources for the period. Professor Pollard insists on this point, again, in the preface to the volume. It "provides ample evidence", he says, "of the hollowness of the commonplace"—"that the materials for English history grow scantier as the Middle Ages draw to a close". This volume is assuredly a first-rate production. A straight-away reading of its varied materials gives a clear impression that, although Lancastrian times were rough and turbulent, nevertheless government and society were healthier, more merciful, less corrupt, and less vicious than in the Yorkist period which followed. The notes on sources (pp. xi-xx) are excellent and the index is of high grade.

G. C. S.

The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine. Text and Translation into English. By Christopher B. Coleman, Ph.D., Professor of History in Allegheny College. (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1922, pp. 183.) Professor Coleman, already favorably known through his excellent monograph *Constantine the Great and Christianity* (1914), offers in the present volume what seems a natural outgrowth of his studies preparatory to that undertaking. It consists of two parts, the text of the *Donation*, with an English translation, and Valla's famous exposure of the forgery, also accompanied by a translation on opposite pages. The text is the fragmentary one given by Gratian, Dr. Coleman having printed the full text in his earlier book. Why he should have borrowed the translation from Henderson's *Select Documents* does not appear. Certainly he is quite capable of doing his own translating, and the reader would feel an added confidence if the versions of text and comment could have been by the same hand.

The text of Valla's treatise is given from the Vatican manuscript, the only complete text known to the editor. Of critical apparatus we have here very little. Only brief reference is made to the several modern editions, and there is no critical description even of the manuscript on which the present edition is based. The translation is spirited, reproducing without exaggeration the pungent style of the original.

Dr. Coleman closes his brief introduction by a reference to his experience in using Valla's treatise with students as an illustration of

sound historical criticism. We welcome his contribution, trusting only that he and other teachers who may make such use of it will give due weight to the circumstances under which the treatise was composed. It would greatly enhance its value if, in a future edition, there were added some really adequate treatment of Valla's personality and the motives which led him to employ his caustic pen in so furious an assault upon the papal administration—not forgetting the final chapter of his repentance (?) and reconciliation.

La Conjuration d'Amboise et Genève. Par Henri Naef, Docteur ès Lettres. [Extrait des *Mémoires et Documents de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*, t. XXXII.] (Geneva, A. Jullien; Paris, Édouard Champion, 1922, pp. 406, 15 fr.) Criticism of this careful and valuable study of the relations between the conspiracy of Amboise and Geneva has been somewhat disarmed by the author's frank admission in the foreword that it is badly proportioned. Many things in the text might with better wisdom have been relegated to the already voluminous foot-notes and appendixes. Certain chapters for which there seems to be no compelling necessity appear to have been laboriously compiled from the secondary accounts; others are distended by the chance accumulation of interesting but not always relevant fact. There is, however, an admirable table of contents, statements of fact are usually clear, and a brief but excellent summary is to be found in the concluding chapter. In spite of obvious defects, the book constitutes an important contribution to the historical literature of the subject and period.

A large amount of new material has not warranted new conclusions of importance either in regard to the character of La Renaudie, the part played by Calvin and his colleagues in the preparations for the insurrection, the accusations made by the Guisard faction and others, or the defense of Geneva against its enemies. We are still to believe that Calvin never actually approved the plans of the conspirators. Some of his followers were undoubtedly indiscreet, he himself might have viewed a successful outcome in a more favorable light, but the available evidence will support the Reformers in their assertion that they bore no real responsibility either for the plot or for its implications. It is this phase of his subject that the author has attacked with the greatest enthusiasm; it forms by far the best portion of his work.

The documents upon which the book is based are to be found almost exclusively in Swiss depositories. One rejoices that the archives at Geneva and at Bern have been searched so thoroughly, but it is a pity that the great French collections have been neglected. Twelve appendixes, comprising more than a third of the volume, facilitate the work of future investigators by giving in full many of the more important letters and papers utilized. The list of the principal works cited, obviously intended to serve as a bibliography, should prove a useful guide.

Several French titles of recognized excellence are omitted; the works of English and American scholars have been completely ignored, with the exception of Walker's *Calvin*, cited in the French translation.

SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

Catalogue of Manuscripts [in] the National Library of Wales. Volume I. *Additional Manuscripts in the Collections of Sir John Williams, Bart., G.C.V.O.* By John Humphreys Davies, M.A., Principal of the University College of Wales. (Aberystwyth, the Library, 1921, pp. xiii, 381, 15 s.) The National Library of Wales is one of the youngest institutions of the sort in the British Isles. But it is already a great library, so administered as to render notable service to literary and historical scholarship. Since it opened its doors in temporary quarters in 1909, it has been established in a suitable building and has acquired very important collections of books and manuscripts relating to the Principality. Mr. Ballinger, the librarian, and associated scholars, by a succession of excellent bibliographical publications, are making information concerning its treasures generally accessible to Celticists and other interested specialists.

The volume now under review is the first part of a *Catalogue of Manuscripts*. It comprises "additional manuscripts" in the collections presented to the library by Sir John Williams, that is to say, manuscripts not included in the *Plâs Llanstephan* catalogue published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 1903. A second volume is promised, to cover the Peniarth Manuscripts not in Welsh, and therefore not included in the *Catalogue of Peniarth Manuscripts* issued by the Commission. The additional manuscripts now described are for the most part later and less important than those previously catalogued, but they are nevertheless of much value for the modern literature and history of Wales, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They include the greatest variety of matter—history, genealogy, grammatical treatises, sermons, and miscellaneous literature in prose and verse. There are copies of the works of the older poets, though the texts are in general of inferior value. But on the modern poets and antiquaries—on Edward Jones ("Bardd y Brenin"), Theophilus Jones, the historian of Brecknock, Dr. Thomas Rees, the historian of Welsh Nonconformity, or Thomas Edwards ("Twm o'r Nant"), to name a few examples—there is abundant material of interest.

The catalogue has been compiled by Principal Davies of the University of Wales, with the assistance of Mr. A. J. Herbert, the late Dr. E. H. Quiggin, and Professor Bensly, who dealt respectively with Arthurian, Gaelic, and Latin items. Their work, as would be expected, measures up to the best bibliographical standards. The descriptions and analyses of manuscripts are minute and thorough, the excerpts in some cases being so numerous that the catalogue reads like a chrestomathy of verse.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Manon Phlipon Roland: Early Years. By Evangeline Wilbour Blashfield. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922, pp. xv, 383, \$3.50.) This volume is the first half of a work in which the lamented author planned to embody the results of a long labor of love upon the history of Madame Roland. Of the second part there remain only notes, several of which her husband, the distinguished painter, has added as appendixes. One is a discriminating discussion of the "Portraits of Mme. Roland". In his introduction Mr. Blashfield has given further information on the same topic. Among the dozen portraits reproduced in the volume the most curious is the "Physionotrace Profile" made by a process popular in the later years of the eighteenth century. Mr. Blashfield says that the result, as in the case of the silhouette, "is only nominally correct and would depend in part on the skill, light-handedness, and art-knowledge of the executant". This example makes Madame Roland's countenance appear heavy, although the effect may be due to the fact that the original at the Carnavalet Museum has been colored, which, Mr. Blashfield explains, "tends to make the photograph harder and coarser". Mrs. Blashfield's work is based upon a painstaking study of all the material left by Madame Roland and her friends, and the amount is enormous, for Madame Roland from girlhood obeyed an irresistible impulse to record her impressions. The author's work has naturally been facilitated by the labors of her predecessors, notably M. Perroud, editor of the Roland letters and memoirs. She has sought other sources of information at the residences of the Rolands in Paris, Amiens, Le Clos de la Platière, Villefranche, and Lyons. Those who know Madame Roland chiefly as the Egeria of the Girondin party will be delightfully surprised by the story of her earlier life. She evidently possessed not only a genius for leadership in times of revolution, but also the traditional virtues of the French wife and mother, readiness for self-sacrifice, dependableness, and skill in management. And her middle-aged husband called for self-sacrifice, for when they were married, being already far on in his career as inspector of manufactures, member of sundry academies, writer of endless reports, soon to become editor of a great *Dictionnaire des Manufactures, Arts et Métiers*, he promptly turned her into an industrious amanuensis and secretary. Not the least surprising incident in the pre-Revolutionary career of the Rolands was the effort in 1784 to obtain letters of nobility. It seems that the family had once held that rank and through reverses of fortune had lost it. The attempt failed and Madame Roland's discovery of the character of the influences requisite for success did not add to her respect for the court and the bureaucracy. It is unfortunate that we are denied the sequel to this valuable study.

H. E. B.

British Diplomacy, 1813-1815: Select Documents dealing with the Reconstruction of Europe. Edited by C. K. Webster, M.A., Professor

of Modern History in the University of Liverpool. (London, G. Bell and Sons, 1921, pp. xlvii, 409, 12s. 6d.) Under this title Professor Webster collects 230 despatches, taken from a possible sixty thousand. They have been chosen to exhibit the views and the negotiations of the British Foreign Office, and its agents on the Continent, during the winding-up of the Napoleonic era. Of the documents, five are reproduced from miscellaneous sources, 43 from the Castlereagh *Correspondence* and 49 from the Wellington *Supplementary Despatches*; the remaining 133, from the Foreign Office Records, are here printed for the first time. The labor of selection and transcription has been heavy; it will be repaid by the use which students of the period will make of a published diplomatic correspondence hitherto accessible only to those who could consult the manuscripts in the Record Office.

It is to be regretted that the printing of so valuable a set of letters should have been undertaken without sufficient regard to the needs of students likely to refer to them. To take an instance in point: a certain writer of despatches from Berlin appears in the text under the singular name of "Jackson". He remains there simply as Jackson, with no initials, no statement of official position, and no further means of identification. In places the editing lacks precision to the point of being misleading. Thus, in calendaring the letters a précis of each is given—the only guide furnished to the contents of the volume; for no index has been provided. Turning, for example, to the précis for Letter II., we find: "Castlereagh to Cathcart. Instructs him to press for the consent of Prussia to the incorporation of various territories in Hanover." Reading the despatch itself we discover that it concerns a representation to be made to the Tsar, and not to the King of Prussia; in fact the letter recites that a second despatch of similar tenor is being forwarded to Berlin. In many other cases the wording of the précis is too vague and loose to serve as a correct guide. Professor Webster obviously had in mind only the few who may read his book through from cover to cover. Should a second edition appear, it might be well to alter the system of editing, so as to render the book usable by students interested in tracing particular despatches, or in pursuing particular questions arising from the general negotiations of the settlement at Vienna. And to this end an index also would be desirable.

C. E. FRYER.

Il Generale Raffaele Cadorna nel Risorgimento Italiano. Per Luigi Cadorna. (Milan, Fratelli Treves, 1922, pp. 401, 30 lire.) This is the most important volume upon *Risorgimento* history which has appeared in Italy in a twelvemonth. Raffaele Cadorna was not one of the first group of the makers of modern Italy, but he bore an active part in events from 1848 to 1870, in which latter year he commanded the Italian armies which occupied Rome. The present volume by his son General Luigi Cadorna is based largely upon his unpublished papers, and contains a great

number of new documents, including his valuable diaries of Piedmontese participation in the campaign of the Crimea, 1855-1856, in which he took part as major of infantry, and of the campaign of 1859, in which as lieutenant-colonel chief-of-staff of the Fifth Division (Cucchiari) he distinguished himself at the battle of San Martino. Cadorna was Tuscan minister of war, 1859-1860; as general commanding the Thirteenth Division he participated in the campaign of 1860, and as commander of the forces of the three Abruzzi he operated against the brigands of southern Italy, 1861-1862. From 1864 to 1873 he held command of the division of Florence, a command which suffered, however, four important interruptions in the course of ten years: first, from the campaign of 1866, in which Cadorna commanded first a division and then an army corps; second, from the revolt of Palermo in the same year, which he was sent to quell as commander of the military forces of the island and special royal commissioner; third, from the disorders in the Emilia in 1869; fourth, from the Roman expedition of 1870.

The Roman expedition is not described in the present volume, because it had already been exhaustively treated by General Raffaele Cadorna himself in his fully documented work, *La Liberazione di Roma nell'anno 1870 e il Plebiscito* (third ed., Turin, Roux, 1898). Upon all of Cadorna's other activities mentioned, important new documents are given. Revelations such as that upon the character of General Cialdini and his quarrel with Cadorna in 1866 (pp. 223-224) are of unquestionable interest. The military criticisms, particularly of the campaigns of 1859 and 1866, are also important as from the pen of General Luigi Cadorna, who was Italian chief-of-staff during the first three years of the Great War, and is a military critic of recognized authority. There is much that is polemical in the volume, which is throughout an uncompromising defense of the career of the father by the son; but the impartial historian must admit the success of the writer's attacks upon General Della Rocca's *Autobiografia* (pp. 123-124), upon General Pollio's *Custoza* (pp. 267-268), and upon General Angioletti's *Alcune Memorie* (pp. 308-313). Both Cadornas were firm believers in the traditions and discipline of the regular army, and it was difficult for them to do full justice to the volunteer troops of Garibaldi; but many of their criticisms of the volunteer forces are just.

H. NELSON GAY.

Corpi Volontari Italiani dal 1848 al 1870. Per Cesare Cesari. (Rome, Stabilimento Poligrafico per l'Amministrazione della Guerra, 1921, pp. viii, 122.) This dictionary of over three hundred different volunteer corps which were organized in various parts of Italy during the last twenty-three years of Italy's struggles for independence and unity has been published by the Historical Bureau of the General Staff of the Italian army, and is a contribution of the first importance to

military history of the *Risorgimento*. A few monographs upon individual corps were published in the valuable series of *Memorie Storiche Militari*, issued by this same Historical Bureau between the years 1909 and 1914, but no synthetic work upon the subject has been prepared until now, and it has been hitherto impossible for the historian to deal adequately with this phase of military history.

The dictionary gives a brief description of each corps, with many references to the various archives scattered throughout Italy, in which the unpublished records of the corps may be found. Colonel Cesari was one of the principal contributors to the *Memorie*, and as head of the Historical Bureau he has become one of the leading authorities on the modern military history of Italy. The dictionary has been compiled almost entirely from unpublished documents, and is richly illustrated with plates, giving portraits of leading volunteer officers and the characteristic uniforms of many of the corps.

H. NELSON GAY.

Le Travail dans l'Europe Moderne. Par G. Renard, Professeur au Collège de France, et G. Weulersse, Professeur au Lycée Carnot. (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1920, pp. 524, 16.80 fr.) This volume is the sixth in the series entitled *Histoire Universelle du Travail*, edited by Georges Renard, and the second of which the editor of the series is joint author. The course of foreign and domestic commerce and the industrial and agricultural development of Europe during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries are ably outlined and the generalizations are those of trained historians.

The pleasing style, the short but carefully selected bibliographies, the summarizing captions, and the excellent illustrations make it a valuable compilation for the general student of industrial history. It is probable that the student who turns to it in quest of fresh information and analysis of industrial and agricultural labor and the effect of the stupendous changes described on the lives of the workers will find the facts meagre and the attention of the authors rarely focused upon these problems. They are dismissed in the old style with a few generalizations which do not illuminate. This is even true in the case of France, where the account is by far most detailed and colorful. Indeed the emphasis put by the French authors on this country is misleading, for while we are without doubt in need of more and better histories of economic conditions in France from 1500 to 1800, the amount of space devoted to the country is not in scale with that of the rest of the volume. In comparison, England and Holland appear to have minor or less important rôles.

In spite of disproportionate brevity, the manual does afford opportunity for comparative study of industrial conditions in Europe during the three centuries through which the authors trace the development of nationalism and the progress of capitalist economy. The characteristics of the development emphasized are the subordination of industry

to commerce, the priority of the textiles in point of time, the slower progress of agriculture, and the increasingly hereditary and monopolistic character of control, in the hands of the capitalists, opposed by a newly emerged proletariat and the consequent intervention of the government.

AMY HEWES.

Der Untergang der Donau-Monarchie: Diplomatische Erinnerungen. Von Baron J. von Szilassy, ehemaligem Oesterreichisch-Ungarischen Gesandten in Griechenland und ehemaligem Gesandten der Ungarischen Republik in Bern. (Berlin, E. Berger und Co., 1921, pp. 424, M. 60.) Baron Szilassy is a Magyar magnate who received his education in French Switzerland and England and who served Austria-Hungary as counsellor and chargé at Bucharest, Tokio, Petrograd, Constantinople, and elsewhere, becoming finally minister to Greece for Austria-Hungary in 1914 and minister to Switzerland for Hungary in 1919. During various crises he was a confidential adviser of Counts Aehrenthal and Berchtold. On two occasions he was slated for the office of Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Baron Szilassy's contribution is a very important one, and there is hardly a subject discussed by him, from the annexation of Bosnia to the break-up of the Habsburg monarchy, upon which he does not cast new light. Most important, however, is his testimony that the appointment of Count Berchtold was a colossal blunder, which gave minor officials in the Foreign Office and the war-party led by Baron Conrad von Hoetzendorf their great opportunity to bring about the "inevitable" war with Serbia. He also points out that it was the Magyar policy of oppression against the non-Magyars and the unbending opposition of the Magyar oligarchy to the federalization of Austria-Hungary which brought about the break-up of that state. Baron Szilassy believed in an entente with Russia and a dual-federalization of the Habsburg monarchy.

The volume should be read by those who still believe Count Berchtold was a sort of Austrian Bismarck because his name is boldly signed on the vital documents. Szilassy, who spent much time as Berchtold's confidential adviser, shows him to have been "weak of will", "timid", "with the judgment of a child", "vacillating" and "inconscient" (p. 224). Chaos reigned in the Foreign Office in Count Berchtold's régime. "Everybody" gave advice, and the origins of vital decisions became so uncertain that it was common to hear that "X. or N. (officials there) made the decision, or perhaps even the porter" (p. 225).

Further information on Emperor Charles's *coup d'état* to "federalize" Austria-Hungary is given, and the emperor is shown to have been reluctant to give up the crown of Poland. The author, in discussing the period since 1918, believes that Hungary was unjustly made the "scapegoat of the World War".

Szilassy's book is worth translating into English. Its contributions are vital to the history of the period, and its point of view (with few exceptions) is that of a very liberal, broad-minded, intelligent, and sympathetic statesman.

ROBERT J. KERNER.

Die Stellung Hollands im Weltkrieg, Politisch und Wirtschaftlich. Von Dr. N. Japikse. Nach der Handschrift übersetzt von Dr. K. Schwendemann. (Gotha, Friedrich Andreas Perthes A.-G., 1921, pp. vii, 383, M. 40.) The story which this volume has to tell bears an aspect of tragedy. As the author indicates, by her position as a minor power encircled by great and warlike neighbors, by her exposed boundaries and vulnerable colonies, by her tradition of independence and non-intervention, and, not least, by the widespread feeling of her citizens that the War of 1914 was primarily another episode in the secular struggle for the hegemony of Europe, the rôle indicated for Holland during the war was that of neutrality, most difficult and thankless of rôles. It could scarcely be otherwise: only a great and self-contained nation, such as America, could afford the grand gesture and vindicate the rights of humanity.

Behind the author's detailed and sober account of the reaction of Dutch opinion to the issues of the war and of the measures adopted by the extra-parliamentary government of Cort van der Linden in attempting honorably to maintain the impartial policy adhered to by common consent, we read of poignant difficulties. Most serious were the crises engendered by the German submarine campaign and by the so-called "blockade" of Germany by the Allies. It were impossible here even to summarize these questions. Suffice it to say that they are the episodes of a story which can scarcely be quite satisfying to citizens of the countries which were leagued against Germany; for the truth is that Holland, largely by virtue of her position as a commercial, colonial, and seafaring power, had even more to suffer from the Allies than from Germany. Some satisfaction may, however, be extracted from the fact that the Dutch were none the less definitely anti-German, though not inferentially pro-Ally. As the author illustrates, none were more outspoken in condemnation of German imperialism, of the invasion of Belgium and the *Lusitania* outrage, than Dutch publicists.

In the latter portion of the book, the author describes the economic, financial, and military measures undertaken by the government during the war; the two concluding sections discuss the problems which arose after the Armistice—the dispute between Holland and the Entente as to the passage of German troops through Limburg, the territorial controversy with Belgium, the Kaiser episode, and the effect upon Holland of the negotiations at Paris.

À l'Ambassade de Washington, Octobre 1917—Avril 1919: les Heures Décisives de l'Intervention Américaine. Par R. de Villeneuve-Trans.

(Paris, Éditions Bossard, 1921, pp. 287, 9 fr.) This book is primarily a study of American public opinion concerning four questions: the extent to which the United States would aid the allied powers, the character of the victory at which it aimed, the kind of a peace it would make, its attitude toward the League of Nations. The presentation of these subjects is based on statements in leading American newspapers, in the utterances of prominent and official persons, including Frenchmen resident in the United States, and in the debates of Congress.

President Wilson's purposes and personality are subjected to penetrating scrutiny, the essence and substance of his policies being thus epitomized: "He was a man and a philosopher before being an American and the head of a government" (p. 200). The discussions of Wilson's experiences in Europe, of the negotiations concerning the League of Nations, and of the opposition to it in the Senate have special merit, with the following words perhaps containing the fundamental reason for the President's failure: "It seemed as if a veil prevented the President from seeing clearly the realities which surrounded him . . ." (p. 202).

In addition to his main theme of America's part in the war and the Treaty of Versailles, the author tells much in a lively and discursive manner about party strife in the United States, conflicts in Congress, life in Washington; gives much space to Roosevelt's opinions about the war and to his foreign policies while President; and devotes two entire chapters to Franco-American relations.

The book is, of course, designed for French readers, who beyond question will find it instructive and entertaining. But for the serious American student of the war it contains little which is new, save additions to the story of how France tried to win American approval for intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. It does not give us that new knowledge concerning French diplomatic activity in the United States which a reader would naturally hope to find.

EARL E. SPERRY.

Arabia. By D. G. Hogarth. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922, pp. vi, 139, 7 s. 6 d.) In this little book the interest and value rise steadily from the beginning to the end. A history of Arabia, however short, must take account of the pre-Muslim times, of the rise of Islam, with the personality and life of Muhammad and the fates of his immediate successors. But all that is in the main stream of the history of the world and has been dealt with a hundred times, and by historians indefinitely better equipped than Mr. Hogarth. So 81 out of Mr. Hogarth's scant 131 pages must go before we reach the justification of his book, the history of Arabia after it—and the Arabs—ceased to hold the middle of the Muslim stage, when the Desert and its people had become as strange and terrible to Muslim travellers as to any stray Christian. These 81 pages are good and the often-told tale is freshly put; that is

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—II.

the one great advantage of a historian who is not a specialist. Of course, there are many slight inaccuracies and no one should quote details from this book as of authority; there is not a single probative reference in it. But these pages do not take us far toward the Arabia of the War or into those dark centuries between of which we still await the full historian.

So seventeen pages must cover from the middle of the tenth to the last quarter of the eighteenth centuries, when modern Arabia began with the rise of Wahhabism. These sketch very lightly the origins of the great Sherifate houses and especially of that of Qatada about 1200 A.D., still regnant at Mecca; the coming of Europe by sea and the broken yet persistent Turkish domination. Zaidism, perhaps for the first time in a popular book, is given its due place. The last 31 pages are practically of our own time and tell of the Wahhabite rising, the intervention of Egypt, the Turkish restoration under the policy of Abd al-Hamid, the uniting of Arabia against the Turks in the recent war, and the breaking up again, which followed, into the old, essential elements. This is the nub of the book, although it would be unintelligible without the hundred pages which precede, and is well and clearly done. The only considerable addition necessary since Mr. Hogarth wrote is that Ibn Sa'ud from Riyadh has now captured Hail and has united for the time all inner Arabia. Thirty years ago Hail ruled Riyadh.

There is an index and a good map.

D. B. MACDONALD.

A Short History of American Literature, based upon the Cambridge History of American Literature. Edited by William Peterfield Trent, John Erskine, Stuart P. Sherman, and Carl Van Doren. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922, pp. v, 407, \$3.50.) This title is likely to mislead, for the book is not a complete history of American literature, condensed to scale from the larger work, but, except for a few unimportant changes, is merely a reprint of certain chapters, chiefly those on the greater authors. The colonial and revolutionary periods are represented only by chapters on Edwards and Franklin; minor writers of the nineteenth century are largely ignored, although some space is given to lesser novelists and to historians, scholars, and philosophers; and the chapters on newspapers and magazines, explorers, transcendentalism, etc., are omitted. The *Short History* therefore lacks the perspective and the lights and shadows which a real history of literature, even on a small scale, may and should have. The volume is, in brief, a collection of essays, most of them excellent, upon individual authors, and will doubtless be welcomed by the general reader who does not care to read the larger work or to make his own selections from it.

W. C. BRONSON.

État de l'Église Catholique ou Diocèse des États-Unis de l'Amérique Septentrionale. Par Jean Dilhet. Translated and annotated by Rev.

Patrick William Browne, S. T. D. [Catholic University of America, Studies in Church History, volume I.] (Washington, D.C., *Salve Regina* Press, pp. xxv, 263, 140.)

Thomas Cornwaleys, Commissioner and Counsellor of Maryland. By George Boniface Stratemeier, O.P. [*Id.*, volume II.] (*Ibid.*, 1922, pp. x, 140.)

The Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 1822-1922. By Edward John Hickey, Ph.D. [*Id.*, volume III.] (*Ibid.*, 1922, pp. x, 196.)

The Catholic Hierarchy of the United States, 1790-1922. By Rev. John Hugh O'Donnell, C.S.C. [*Id.*, volume IV.] (*Ibid.*, 1922, pp. xiv, 223.)

A cordial welcome is to be extended to the new series of *Studies in American Church History* which has been founded by Professor Peter Guilday, in charge of that department in the Catholic University of America, and of which the first four issues are here presented. Their nature is varied—documentary text, narrative monograph, and compiled manual. The first and largest is an edition of a general account of Catholicism in the United States prepared in the early days of the nineteenth century by Father Jean Dilhet, who was in this country from 1798 to 1807, serving at Detroit from 1798 to 1805, and then at Baltimore and in Pennsylvania. His manuscript, preserved in the archives of the Sulpician seminary in Baltimore, extends to 140 printed pages of French. A translation, not wholly accurate, is printed on opposite pages, and there are some 85 pages of notes, learned and useful, though at times redundant. Father Dilhet, after some general remarks, goes over the whole area of the United States, state by state, county by county in some instances, and mission by mission. The error of the earlier copyist whereby the valuable list of Catholic priests in the United States and the account of the mission at Newcastle, Maine, are interjected amid the counties of Maryland should have been rectified. Father Dilhet had of course not seen all the places of which he writes, and his observations are not always accurate, but, taken all together, they cast a flood of light on the situation of his church in 1807 which is to be obtained from no other one source, and which makes a most valuable addition to our knowledge. Many if not most of the page-numbers in the index are incorrect by one number. Father Stratemeier's monograph on Thomas Cornwaleys may be questioned as belonging only in a sense to the field of church history, but is industrious and thorough. Father Hickey's history of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith (missionary society founded at Lyons in 1822) is an admirable piece of work, based on thorough study in European archives and at home, and written with an unusually broad apprehension of the society's relation to the church and to the world of which it formed a part. The fourth study is a very useful book of reference, in which the student will find listed all the archbishops and bishops consecrated for provinces and sees in the United States, with a

brief biography of each and a body of references for the further study of his life.

Washington and his Comrades in Arms: a Chronicle of the War of Independence. By George M. Wrong. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XII.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1921, pp. xii, 295.) We are under deep obligations to Professor Wrong for giving us in brief compass an unbiassed but sympathetic account of the American Revolution. We have had Belcher's acrimonious Tory view, and Trevelyan's admiring Whig view of the Revolution, and we have had the labored detachment of Lecky and Mahon. Bancroft has deified the Revolutionary fathers, Fiske has glorified them, and we have had them cynically presented by Sydney George Fisher. It is a great boon to have them soberly, judiciously, capably handled by a distinguished scholar who has given, perhaps, a more balanced account because he is not a specialist in the field. One is always conscious that the author feels as an American feels upon a matter where there is room for controversy, and yet he keeps the balance on the cool side of sentiment in all the problems that he weighs. Perhaps none but a Canadian could have done it so well.

The main criticism one would make is of the neglect of certain fundamental subjects like the powers and business methods of Congress, the making of the state constitutions, the evolution of political forms and institutions, and the development of political ideals. Since the whole outcome of the war depended upon the diplomatic activities in the European courts it would seem that much more space might have been given to an account of them. Unless there is another volume in the series which has not appeared, and which deals with those questions, it would seem a serious fault of the editor or of the author that these subjects are either omitted or lightly touched upon. All of these omitted subjects had vastly more influence upon all the American future than most of the problems actually dealt with. No one who knows the author can have the slightest doubt of his ability to deal with these problems in the ablest manner if it were his intention to do so, and the reflection therefore would seem to lie upon the plan of the series. Such an omission could hardly have been due to the need that the treatment be popular, for the subjects are full of human interest if handled with imagination, a faculty which in its best sense Professor Wrong displays in a high degree. It is unfortunate that so satisfying a treatment of a vital period of American history should have been marred by this fault.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

La Política de los Estados Unidos en el Continente Americano. [Biblioteca "La Cultura Cubana", volume III.] By Raúl de Cárdenas. (Havana, Sociedad Editorial *Cuba Contemporánea*, 1921, pp. viii, 284.) Señor Cárdenas's evident aim is to give his Spanish-American reader an accurate conception of the manner in which the United States has reached its present position of power and influence in the American

continent. The first section of his book sketches briefly the history of each successive addition to the territory of the Union. The second describes the origin and history of the Monroe Doctrine, and the third discusses the more recent relations between the United States and the countries bordering on the Caribbean Sea. There are numerous quotations from North American writers and statesmen by which the author seeks to give an unprejudiced picture of the motives which have guided the policy of the American government and to show that the expansion of American influence is merely a necessary consequence of the geographical situation and of the economic development of the United States. The book is notably free from the exaggeration and tendency to propaganda which have too often characterized the treatment of these subjects both by Latin-American and by Anglo-American authors; and the advantages which our nearer neighbors have derived from their relations with the United States, as well as those aspects of our Caribbean policy which the author believes open to criticism, are discussed in a spirit of fairness which lends a special interest to the author's concluding pages.

Based as it is mainly upon the writings of North American authors, the book contains relatively little that will be new to the historical student in this country. The reader cannot but feel that the author has derived his historical material largely from works of a rather popular nature. The book is nevertheless an important contribution to the literature in Spanish upon the relations between the United States and Latin America.

DANA G. MUNRO.

The American Embargo, 1807-1809, with particular reference to its Effect on Industry. By Walter Wilson Jennings, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Commerce. [University of Iowa Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. VIII., no. 1.] (Iowa City, the University, 1921, pp. 242, \$1.50.) A sizable monograph, like this, issued under scholarly auspices, treating a well-worked, limited theme, incurs heavy liabilities. Intended primarily for scholarly readers, it must justify itself by its immediate pertinence, vital contributions, or, certainly, definitive scholarship. Yet any enhanced pertinence of the Embargo problem due to recent world events—intimations of its "Editorial Introduction" notwithstanding—this study apparently ignores. Fundamentally it represents just a painstaking utilization of fairly representative contemporary journals—material with inherent limitations, already adequately exploited, evidently, since this fuller search adds to findings of precursors little besides a plethora of old-newspaper puns and prejudices.

The limitations of this research, in scope and character, are regrettable. Having been restricted to a few Midwest libraries, it ignores the whole body of American and foreign manuscript materials indispensable for any real restudy of its problem. Moreover, its considerable bibliography of printed materials omits essential sources like *Niles' Register*, the

Girard and the Morse letters, also vital scholarly studies of Mahan, Updyke and others, although it lists some new items of merit with others more dubious and mere text-books. Nor is the listing always logical in classifications and exact in citations. Moreover, miscitation and persistent misspelling, in William Pinkney's case, is aggravated by implying the misspelling of that diplomat's signature in *American State Papers* (p. 31 n.). Yet more to be deprecated than such lapses are deficiencies of grasp, perspective, and critical acumen. Evidences of such deficiencies are the effort for an unreal, mechanical simplicity in handling diplomatic and political background, the use of inadequately controlled statistics, and a pervading penchant for mere contemporary opinion, such as citing American hearsay editorials and Congressional speeches for Embargo effects abroad, despite vital contrary evidence published from foreign archives. Such fundamental faults give the study an inconclusiveness which is not remedied by another marked tendency to overmuch cautious balancing of contradictory evidence at the expense of logical unity and clarity. Nevertheless, thanks to its dominantly traditional conception, largely, the deductions from this research are essentially those of the standard authorities and text-books regarding the Embargo. Consequently, although this readable monograph seems to have the marks of the usual dissertation, it scarcely can be appraised a really valid or distinctive contribution to historical scholarship.

F. E. M.

E. H. Harriman: a Biography. By George Kennan. In two volumes. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922, pp. xvii, 421; ix, 421, \$7.50.) Theodore Roosevelt and Edward Henry Harriman were the great protagonists of the two principles whose conflict gives the meaning to the first decade of the present century. The historian has thus far been forced to seek a judgment upon the merits of their struggle from the formal documents created in the course of public business, and the partizan and fragmentary details that have from year to year leaked into the hands of editors. The time is now approaching when the biographical data concerning the leaders in the contest will make it possible to reach conclusions of permanent utility. And this book by a seasoned journalist adds greatly to the materials upon which such a conclusion may be based.

Like many historical personages of our day, Harriman did not leave an important archive of working papers; or at least his biographer makes no parade of one. There are letters justificatory, and memoranda prepared by Harriman to preserve special data, as well as many memoirs prepared for Mr. Kennan's use by the men who worked with Harriman. There is much analysis of financial reports, and of details concerning the railroad mergers. Throughout the volumes there is a spirited defense of Harriman's view and acts. The altruistic side of his life is brought forward to give testimony to character, though with less grace

and carrying less conviction than John Muir's sketch. The book is written in the full assumption that the beneficial and useful work of the leaders of our industrial age has been hampered at every turn by demagogues and ambitious adventurers.

Unquestionably there is a case to be made for the consolidators, though it cannot be made complete by one who like Mr. Kennan sees no virtue in the attempt of government to establish a control over industry and traffic. Harriman is brought out as a builder rather than a speculator. By chapter and verse it is proved that his properties were made more productive because of his management of them. His great adventure in Union Pacific, and the southwest merger, is described with much useful detail. And the literature of railroad consolidation has been combed for expressions of opinion that the Northern Securities decision, if good law, was at least bad policy.

The Harriman-Roosevelt controversy receives attention that will interest any student attracted by the merits of various memberships in the Ananias Club. The letters that are printed tend to strengthen the conviction that the facts immediately involved did not warrant the outburst, and that the explosion was more directly due to accumulated irritation and congested emotions. After all, when Harriman and Roosevelt, or Harriman and Sherman engaged in private converse and subsequently disagreed, neither was good authority for the motives of the other.

If Mr. Kennan had been less of a partizan, he would possibly have been less effective as a biographer.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

American Portraits, 1875-1900. By Gamaliel Bradford. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922, pp. xvii, 249, \$3.50.) The author says in his preface that this group of portraits is the first of a series of seven volumes, in which he hopes "to cover American history", including "representative figures in all the varied lines of life, statesmen and men of action, writers, artists, preachers, scholars, professional men, and men prominent in the business world"—a sufficiently ambitious project, the difficulty of which is recognized by the author, who says, however, "I am concerned with their souls and deal with their work only as their souls are illustrated in it."

In the present volume the difficulty has been lessened by choosing figures—writers, artists, politicians (Mark Twain, Henry Adams, Lanier, Henry James, Whistler, Joseph Jefferson, Blaine, Cleveland)—who afford a biographer plenty of material for the understanding of their souls. The sketches first appeared in magazines, and are short, less than thirty pages each. They are based upon study of the subjects' letters and other writings and upon the standard lives of them, reminiscences and estimates by their friends, etc.; there is no evidence of personal knowledge or of original research by the author.

The value of *American Portraits* must depend, therefore, upon the insight and judgment of the biographer in studying the published mate-

rial and upon his skill in precipitating the results of his study into a brief sketch. In general the value is considerable. Mr. Bradford has the gift of penetrating to the centre of the nature he is analyzing; he is both sympathetic and critical; and his style, although marred by some "modern" carelessness and smartness, is vigorous and vivid and always readable. Each sketch leaves with the reader a distinct picture of a real and interesting personality. The narrow limits forbid full portraiture, and in focusing for unity and sharpness of outline, the biographer necessarily sacrifices something of the modifying effect of minor details; but, on the whole, breadth of view and truth of perspective are fairly well preserved.

The sketch of Jefferson is the slightest and the least worthy of a place in the group; that of James is the feeblest. Mark Twain is painted *con amore*, with great verve, yet the painter sees clearly the limitations and faults of his subject and is perhaps too severe on the whole. The contrasts between the slippery brilliancy of Blaine and the stolid, blunt honesty of Cleveland are brought out with a delicate yet sure hand. Although these two are the only members of the group who were prominent figures in American political history, the relations of Mark Twain, Adams, and Lanier to American life in general receive due emphasis.

W. C. BRONSON.

Making Woodrow Wilson President. By William F. McCombs, Chairman, Democratic National Convention. Edited by Louis Jay Lang. (New York, Fairview Publishing Company, 1921, pp. 309, \$2.50.) Every avenue and boulevard of approach to this book should be placarded "Detour", so as to warn off students and others seeking to acquire a knowledge of the history of our times. There are as many ways of making Presidents as there are "of writing tribal lays", but not "every single one of them is right". The making of a President is a curious, complicated, and interesting business. A true and comprehensive account by an actual participant is not yet available. Certainly this book does not nearly live up to its title. It was apparently written to ease a grudge against Mr. Wilson. Mr. McCombs did not write all of it. He died before the book was published. His assistant, or editor, Mr. Louis Jay Lang, is a veteran worker in the Hearst vineyard. It is enough to say that the material is badly arranged, full of inaccuracies, and does not inspire confidence. It will prove particularly annoying and distressing to those persons who had any knowledge of the preliminary campaign leading up to Mr. Wilson's nomination at Baltimore in 1912. If the narrative has any value at all, it is in its unconscious revelation of Mr. McCombs, who seems to have kept voluminous notes about his grievances against Wilson, but to no end.

This is the sort of book that is best left in obscurity.

Our Navy at War. By Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, 1913 to 1921. (New York, George H. Doran Company, [1922], pp. vi, 390, \$3.00.) A volume of nearly four hundred pages describing the activities of the United States Navy by an official who was the administrative chief of that navy during the whole period of the World War must, from that very fact, command attention, whatever its character may be. Mr. Daniels's book is just the kind of a work one would expect from a journalist; graphically and chattily written, with a wealth of anecdote, and copiously and interestingly illustrated. Here and there may be found accounts of activities contained in no other published volume, such as chapter XXIII., which describes the working of the secret service under the Office of Naval Intelligence. The book possesses many of the merits and most of the weaknesses of an intentionally popular work; but it has evidently been too quickly thrown together, and is too inaccurate to be accepted in any manner as history.

History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919. By Philip Alexander Bruce, LL.B., LL.D. Volume V. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1922, pp. vii, 477, \$4.50.) Dr. Bruce has successfully avoided in this closing volume of his extensive work all temptation to huddle his narrative at its close. He covers the period 1904-1919, the last of the nine into which the five volumes are divided, with all the dignity of manner and the authoritative copiousness of material to be found in his preceding installments, and, although he is describing changes which appear to have diminished, if the phrase be admissible, the uniqueness of the institution of which he is the historian, it would be unfair to infer that his pages have suffered in consequence an appreciable decline in interest or in philosophical significance. His treatment of what is probably the main change, the substitution of a permanent president for the less effective chairman of the faculty, is balanced and sympathetic, and his account of the expansion of the university under the new system of government established in response to the needs of the much altered South is comprehensive and optimistic. The attitude of the institution toward the vexed question of extending educational privileges to women is discussed without partizanship, and even in the pages which deal with the achievements of students and alumni during the World War the emotion displayed suggests no essential loss of the impartiality we expect of a historian. In wealth of details illustrative of the growth of the university during the period covered the volume is inferior to none of its predecessors, and to the younger alumni, as well as to persons interested in the South of to-day, it may well seem the most attractive portion of the narrative. An index of more than forty pages closes fitly a very notable work, which is not merely a history of the fortunes of an important university, but also a valuable source of information with regard to the culture of the South during the past hundred years.

W. P. TRENT.

The Convention of 1846. The Struggle over Ratification, 1846-1847. Edited by Milo M. Quaife. [Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Collections, vols. XXVII., XXVIII.; Constitutional Series, vols. II., III.] (Madison, the Society, 1919, 1920, pp. 827; 716, \$2.00 each.) These volumes, together with the first volume of the series, on *The Movement for Statehood, 1845-1846*, present a full documentary history of Wisconsin's first effort to form a state constitution. The editor is to be complimented upon the thoroughness with which the record has been reconstructed from official records and from the newspapers of the period. When the series has been completed by the publication in equal detail of the material bearing upon the framing and adoption of the constitution of 1848, it will be possible to write definitively the history of the formative period of constitution-making in Wisconsin.

When so much has been offered, it may perhaps be ungenerous to ask for more; but the usefulness of these volumes, both to students and to others, would be increased by historical introductions to each volume, calling attention in some detail to the significance of the documents printed therein. The historical introduction to the first volume of the series is useful, but it should be supplemented by critical comment in each volume. This defect may perhaps satisfactorily be met by a full account of the state's constitutional history, after the completion of the series.

The University of Chicago Biographical Sketches. Volume I. By Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed. (Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, 1922, pp. ix, 393, \$3.20.) This is a filial volume. It records a part of the debt owed by the University of Chicago and its community to the men who earned greatly and gave wisely in their behalf. From the fact that it is numbered volume I., it may be inferred that the record is not yet complete. But no succeeding volumes in this *Acta Sanctorum* can have the variety of interest that this possesses. Without exception the Chicago benefactors of first rank were American born; and in nearly every case they came of families colonial bred. In a community whose wealth and whose present management are so largely in the hands of the recent alien, this fact is of much significance. The men who had the vision to reorganize and endow the university in 1892 were not visionaries, or of the idle rich. They were intensely practical in affairs. John D. Rockefeller, the greatest of the donors, is yet living, and hence is excluded from this volume. His creative hand, and those of his co-workers touch our modern social evolution at every novel side. The bench and bar are here among the benefactors. But alongside these are exponents of Yankee ingenuity as well as New England culture. The refrigerator car is here, and the stock-yards, and the slaughter-houses. Petroleum, the department store, the railroad, the cracker-bakery, the steam radiator, the windmill, and the Diamond Jo line of river steamers, have all paid tribute to higher education. It is

a highly American composite that is portrayed. The historian owes something to the university for so firmly establishing the indigenous character of its culture. The individual biographies are naturally somewhat uncritical and laudatory.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Seventy Years of Progress in Washington. By Ezra Meeker. (Seattle, the Author, 1921, pp. 381, 52, \$5.00.) Through a striking personality in old age and through recent crossing and recrossing of the American continent with ox-teams while marking the old historic Oregon Trail, Ezra Meeker has become the best-known pioneer in this country. Heretofore he has published a number of books, such as *Pioneer Reminiscences of Puget Sound*, *The Ox Team*, and *Eighty-Five Years of a Busy Life*. This present work is larger than any of the others. Of course it traverses the same ground as the others. He has added statistics about temperatures, about schools and industries, to justify the word "progress" in the title. The author does his best writing when dealing with pioneer home experiences. Such portions of his book will live longest.

Unfortunately, Mr. Meeker felt it necessary to repeat on pages 345-350, from his former work—*The Tragedy of Leschi*—certain statements to the effect that Chief Leschi had been wrongfully executed for murder. He seems to have forgotten that his brother Oliver P. Meeker was chairman of an indignation meeting and that he himself was a member of the committee which drafted resolutions condemning those who retarded justice by delaying the execution of which he now complains. The proceedings of that meeting were published in the *Pioneer and Democrat* on January 29, 1858, and were republished in the *Washington Historical Quarterly*, January, 1914.

On pages 351 to 381, Mr. Meeker includes a chapter on Indian Wars from the pen of Maurice FitzGerald, a former Indian scout with General O. O. Howard.

The author has also added, as an appendix of 52 pages, the reprint of a rare pamphlet which he had issued in 1870 under the title *Washington Territory West of the Cascade Mountains*. That certainly adds materially to the value of the present work.

The interesting illustrations include a portrait of the venerable author (with a place for his autograph) on his ninety-first birthday, December 29, 1921, which was also the date of publication.

EDMOND S. MEANY.

The Railroads of Mexico. By Fred Wilbur Powell, Ph.D. (Boston, Stratford Company, 1921, pp. vii, 226, \$2.00.) This small volume is partly the result of investigations carried on while its author was connected with the Doheny Research Foundation, which had its headquarters at the University of California, and partly the result of later research. It constitutes a needed chapter in the history of transportation on the North American continent. The task essayed in its writing was of no small

proportions, for Dr. Powell was confronted by the fact of the breakdown of the facilities for obtaining information after 1910, the last normal year of Mexico. Hence, the data obtainable were at times only fragmentary and not entirely trustworthy, either because of delay in the publication of reports or of contradictions in the published reports, both official and unofficial. In view of the difficulties encountered, the author, whose special training has well fitted him for an investigation of this character, has with commendable caution considered his task to be that of reporting "the results of a study of all available information which will contribute to an understanding of the situation and to a consideration of its remedy".

The book is divided into three parts: (1) a study of the present and of the period following the Díaz régime; (2) a brief summary account of the development of that great system of land transportation which so rapidly brought Mexico out of a long period of economic stagnation; and (3) certain background considerations and conclusions (consisting of chapters on the relations with the government, and results, political and economic). In treating his subject, the author has made considerable use of direct quotations from reports and accounts, by which he has shown the conditions of the railroads and the disaster that has overtaken them, and the methods employed in their working. It seems to the present reviewer that the author might with profit have followed a more logical arrangement of the valuable material which he presents by giving the background and historical matter first and following this with a review of the present condition of the railroads and the future outlook. In any such arrangement as that suggested, the second part would naturally precede the first. However, this criticism cannot be dogmatically defended, for it is apparent that Dr. Powell has been chiefly interested in the present unsatisfactory condition of transportation, and he has evidently deliberately chosen his method of presentation.

A great deal of valuable information concerning concessions, construction, financing, and operation of Mexican railroads has here been brought together for the first time. Other data may be found that will supplement those here gathered together, but they will scarcely affect the basic conclusions to be deduced from the present work. The history of the various lines that have been built in Mexico adds materially to the value of the book. The bibliography of twenty-four pages is the most voluminous and valuable of which the reviewer knows. The index is rather better than is generally found in books of this nature. There is a railroad map of Mexico, which was prepared in the War College in Washington in 1916. A few slips in proof-reading have been noticed.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The thirty-seventh annual meeting of the American Historical Association is to take place at New Haven, beginning on the afternoon of Wednesday, December 27, and ending Saturday noon, December 30. The chairman of the committee on the programme is Professor David S. Muzzey of Columbia University; the chairman of the committee on local arrangements, Professor Max Farrand of Yale University. The programme is to be made simpler and shorter than usual, giving the members more opportunity to talk with each other or otherwise dispose of their time. It is hoped that a high official of the United States government, and Sir Robert Borden, late prime minister of the Dominion of Canada, may address the Association. The sessions thus far provided for are sessions in the history of the United States, for which the programme is in charge of Professor Dixon R. Fox; in English history, Professor Robert L. Schuyler; in Latin-American history, Professor Charles E. Chapman; in the history of the Far East, Professor Kenneth S. Latourette; in that of the Near East, Professor W. L. Westermann; and in legal history, Professor George E. Woodbine. The first edition of the programme may be expected to be sent to members before the end of November.

In advance of the publication of the other two volumes of the *Annual Report* for 1919, the Government Printing Office has brought out as a supplementary volume Miss Grace G. Griffin's annual bibliography, *Writings on American History, 1919* (pp. xxii, 227). The volume, prepared with the same admirable care as its predecessors, in accordance with forms which we may trust are by this time familiar to most members of the Association, records 2782 items of books and articles on United States, Canadian, and Hispanic-American history.

By the will of Professor Dunning (see the next page), the sum of \$5000 is bequeathed to the Association, subject to the payment of the income to a relative during her lifetime.

It is perhaps desirable to mention in this place that the bills for annual dues, sent out to members of the American Historical Association in September by its treasurer, have been made out in accordance with the vote passed by the Association at its last annual meeting, amending the constitution in such manner that after September 1, 1922, the beginning of a new fiscal year, the annual dues were to be five dollars instead of three. From the same date, the fee for life-membership became one hundred dollars instead of fifty.

PERSONAL

We have with great regret to record the death of William Archibald Dunning, professor of history and political philosophy in Columbia University, who died in New York on August 25, aged 65. A graduate of Columbia (A.B. 1881, Ph.D. 1885), he began teaching in that university in 1886, and was a professor in it—and an exceptionally useful one—from 1891 till his death. As a member of the Executive Council of the American Historical Association, 1892–1902, and chairman of its committee on publication, 1906–1910, he rendered most valuable services to the Association. He was its president in 1913. To this journal he was from the beginning a constant and helpful friend, though his relation to the *Political Science Quarterly*, of which he was managing editor from 1894 to 1903, prevented him from being a frequent contributor.

His chief published work was his *History of Political Theories* (1902, 1905, 1920), a masterly survey of the writers on political theory, from the Greeks to Spencer, marked by learning, insight, sound criticism, and clarity of thought and style. The other chief field of his interest was that of American history in the period indicated by the title of his *Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction* (1898); besides these essays in the constitutional history of that period, he published an admirable volume, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (1907), in the *American Nation* series, which showed more amply his gifts of style, in telling narrative and effective portrayal. With his keen powers of analysis and his humorous detachment from the ancient prejudices with which that portion of our history had been environed, he was able to view it with a wholesome freshness and to make its history a rational story. Similar qualities, with a freer hand, marked his book on *The British Empire and the United States* (1916). But that which after all gave most distinction to Professor Dunning's career was his achievement as a teacher, for his work with graduate students resulted in what may fairly be called a school of younger investigators and writers on the history of the United States in the period of Civil War and Reconstruction, and a still larger host of students were bound to him by ties of well-deserved affection. His lively wit and kindly disposition made him a most engaging companion, and he was a warm and genial friend.

Ernest Lavisse, of the French Academy, *doyen* of French historians, died on August 18, at the age of 79. Beginning his career as private secretary of Victor Duruy, he taught for several years in various lycées, then, 1875–1880, in the École Normale Supérieure, of which he was afterward director, and from 1888 till 1920 he was professor of modern history in the Faculty of Letters in Paris. His earlier publications lay in the field of Prussian history; among them were his *Études sur l'Histoire de Prusse* (1879); *Trois Empereurs d'Allemagne: Guillaume I., Frédéric III., Guillaume II.* (1888); *La Jeunesse du Grand Frédéric* (1891); and *Le Grand Frédéric avant l'Avènement* (1893). His re-

markable little *Vue Générale de l'Histoire Politique de l'Europe* (1890) is familiar to many students in the English translation provided by the late Professor Gross. His chief historical work in more recent years consisted in editing, with the late Alfred Rambaud, the twelve volumes of the *Histoire Générale* (1893-1904), and, individually, the nine volumes of the *Histoire de France des Origines jusqu'à la Révolution* (1901-1911), of which he himself wrote the two half-volumes devoted to Louis XIV., and the eight volumes of the *Histoire de France Contemporaine, 1789-1919* (1920-1921). For many years he had been a man of great influence in French education, both because of the vigor of his thought in that field and because of the extraordinary hold he won upon the affections of young men; only two or three men of the recent generation have done so much for the improvement of the higher education in France.

We regret to announce the death, on July 10, of Sir George Prothero, friend of many American historical scholars, and well known in the United States by reason of visits and lectures here. Born in 1848, he was for some eighteen years a teacher of history in King's College, London, then, 1894-1899, professor of history in the University of Edinburgh. Since that date he had been editor of the *Quarterly Review*. He was for four years president of the Royal Historical Society, and was chairman of a committee, with which a committee of the American Historical Association co-operated, for the preparation of a large bibliography of modern English history. His volume of *Select Statutes and other Documents bearing on the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.* (1894) has been widely used in colleges. He was editor of the *Cambridge Historical Series*, and one of the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History*. As director of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office during the latter part of the war, he prepared the series of *Peace Handbooks* issued by that department; it was indeed his public services in war-time that undermined his health. Along with great learning and abilities, he was marked by extraordinary kindness of disposition and charm of manner.

Professor Henri Pirenne of Ghent visits the United States this autumn in the interest of the Educational Foundation established by the Commission for Relief in Belgium, but is, unfortunately for us, not able to remain long enough to attend the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. Another eminent European historian who lectures in the United States this autumn is Hon. John W. Fortescue, president of the Royal Historical Society, author of the *History of the British Army*.

Dr. Abbott P. Usher, hitherto of Boston University, has been made assistant professor in Harvard University, charged with instruction in economic history.

Dr. Lawrence Martin, drafting officer in the Department of State, formerly associate professor of geography in the University of Wisconsin, will give courses on the historical geography of post-bellum Europe during the first semester of the present academic year at Clark University. He will be followed in the second semester by Professor A. L. P. Dennis, formerly of the University of Wisconsin, who will give courses on the recent history of the British Empire and on the foreign policies of Soviet Russia.

Professor Sidney B. Fay of Smith College and Professor Dana C. Munro of Princeton have leave of absence during the second half of the present academic year.

At Princeton University Mr. Dayton Voorhees has been promoted to an assistant professorship of history.

Mr. Wayland F. Dunaway has been promoted to associate professor of history in Pennsylvania State College.

Dr. George A. Wood, formerly of Ohio State University, has been made professor of history at Lake Forest College, Illinois.

Professor W. M. Gewehr, formerly of Morningside College, Sioux City, has been appointed professor of history in Denison University as successor to Dr. K. S. Latourette. Dr. Warner Woodring of the University of Chicago goes to Morningside as professor, and Mr. John W. Hoffman of Chicago as assistant professor.

In the University of Minnesota Professor A. B. White has returned to his duties after a year's leave of absence, but Professor Samuel B. Harding, acting professor of history in his absence, remains as director of the academic work in the Extension Division, and will also hold a lectureship in the department of history.

Mr. Theodore C. Gronert, professor of history in the Texas College of Industrial Arts, has been elected professor of European history in the University of Arkansas, and entered on his duties there in September.

On appointment offered by the government of Mexico to the University of Texas, Dr. Charles W. Hackett spent a large part of the summer in the Mexican capital, occupied in researches in the federal archives.

The surname of Professor Carl Christophelsmeier of the University of South Dakota has been changed to Christol.

Professor Waldemar C. Westergaard of Pomona College has received an appointment as travelling fellow on the American-Scandinavian Foundation, and will spend most of the present academic year in Sweden, occupied with the study of Baltic problems.

Professor J. L. Morison of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, has resigned his position there and returned to England, where he has be-

come professor of history in Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne. His place at Kingston is taken by Dr. D. M. MacArthur, formerly of the Public Archives of Canada.

Dr. Hubert Hall, who for forty-two years has been connected with the Public Record Office in London, most of the time as an assistant keeper, and in that office has rendered constant and invaluable service to American investigators and students, retired from the Public Record Office some months ago. We make the fact known in order that Americans seeking information from that office may look elsewhere; but Dr. Hall continues his work for the Royal Historical Society and his lecturing in the University of London.

Friends of the late Professor Alfred Cauchie will be interested in reading a careful and excellent survey of his life-work by one of his chief pupils, Abbé F. Baix, *Alfred Cauchie* (Charleroi, *Terre Wallonne*, pp. 29). Another excellent account, by Professor Léon Van der Essen, appears in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for April-July.

GENERAL

The Fourth International Congress of Historical Studies, held in London in April, 1913, voted that the next should be held in St. Petersburg in April, 1918, but no such meeting has occurred in these nine years. It is now arranged that such a congress shall be held at Brussels, April 8-15, 1923, under the patronage of the King of the Belgians. The invitations are sent out by the Royal Academy of Belgium; Professor Henri Pirenne is president of the committee of organization, Father Hippolyte Delehaye, S. J., and Professor Franz Cumont the vice-presidents; the address of the secretary is: Dr. F. L. Ganshof, 12 rue Jacques Jordaens, Brussels. Provision has been made for thirteen sections, representing the various divisions and aspects of history, and for co-operation, by committees in many lands, in the work of organization. The president of the American Historical Association has appointed a committee to act for it in making such preparations as may be requisite for participation by historical scholars in the United States. It consists of J. F. Jameson, chairman, Clarence W. Alvord, Carl R. Fish, Tenney Frank, Waldo G. Leland, James T. Shotwell, and Paul Van Dyke. The chairman would be glad to receive the names of any persons who think of attending, and to supply desired information. It is hoped that many Americans will be present; the Belgian committee has expressed this hope in terms especially cordial. The fee for membership is fifty Belgian francs. Preceding congresses were held at Paris in 1900, at Rome in 1903, at Berlin in 1908, and at London in 1913.

The Historical Congress, mentioned in previous issues of this journal, which accompanies the Brazilian celebration of the centennial anniversary of independence, opened in Rio de Janeiro on September 7. It was

attended by several members of the committee appointed for the purpose by the American Historical Association.

The American Library in Paris is endeavoring to strengthen its department of American history, economics, and political science, and would be glad to receive gifts of books in this field, especially of standard or more recent works. In order to avoid duplication it would be well for those who have books which they are willing to dispose of in this way to communicate first with the director of the library, Mr. W. Dawson Johnston, 10 rue de l'Elysée, Paris VIII. An advisory committee on American history has been appointed, consisting of Professor Bernard Moses, M. Bernard Fay, Mr. Robert W. Neeser, and Mr. Waldo G. Leland, chairman.

The prize of \$3000 offered by the Historical Committee of the Knights of Columbus (among other prizes) for the best historical work submitted by a university or college professor of history has been awarded to Professor Samuel F. Bemis, of Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington, for a monograph on the Jay Treaty, the fruit of long researches, which will soon be published.

The quinquennial prizes, of \$1000 and \$400 respectively, known as the Loubat Prizes, will be awarded at the commencement of Columbia University next June, for the best work printed and published in the English language (but not necessarily by a citizen of the United States), on the history, geography, archaeology, ethnology, philology, or numismatics of North America. Correspondence on the subject, and works submitted in competition, should be addressed to the secretary of Columbia University, New York City.

Mr. C. Graham Botha, formerly archivist of the Cape Province, was in 1919 appointed chief archivist for the Union of South Africa, and presently sent on a tour of inspection in foreign countries, of which the fruits are now presented in a *Report of a Visit to Various Archives Centres in Europe, United States of America, and Canada* (Pretoria, Government Printing Office, pp. 67). The report not only amply justifies the effort made by the government of the Union to inform itself as to the best practices of foreign archives, for the future benefit of its own archive establishments, central and provincial, but it will also be of much interest and value to readers elsewhere, as the latest comprehensive survey. The archives inspected were those of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, the United States, and Canada. In a short time an astonishing amount of information was collected, nearly all of it accurate. The practices of the various countries in respect to the centralization of archives, to the relations between central archives and those of ministerial departments of government, to housing, custody, care, arrangement, repair, destruction of useless papers, administration, publications, and public use are all intelligently summarized, and applications which we should suppose to be wholly judicious are made to the

special problems of South Africa. The classical *Report of the Royal Commission on the Public Records*, though little heeded thus far by officials in London, seems likely to bear good fruit at the Cape; but the admirable methods of the Dutch will naturally have their weight, and those of the French and Belgians as well. What the Americans have said about archives comes in for commendation and quotation by Mr. Botha; he cannot well praise what they have done.

The many who have read with interest and enjoyment Professor Harry E. Barnes's article on "History: its Rise and Development" in the *Encyclopedia Americana* will be glad to know that reprints of it, from the revised edition, can now be obtained from the author, at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, at a nominal cost.

Mr. H. G. Wells is following up his *Outline of History* with *A Short History of Mankind*, a simpler endeavor of the same general sort, at less than half the length. Another attempt to sketch the history of the world in brief compass is Dr. Hendrik W. Van Loon's *The Story of Mankind*, which has attained wide popularity.

The fifth series of lectures arranged for by Mr. F. S. Marvin for summer sessions in England, and subsequently edited by him as essays, is published under the title *Western Races and the World (Unity Series V., London, Humphrey Milford)*. The general trend of the lectures is to exhibit the unity of the main stream of development in Western civilization.

On March 9 last, the sixtieth anniversary of the battle between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, after commemorative exercises, undertook to forward, as amply as possible, the collection of material relating to the work of Cornelius H. DeLamater and Captain John Ericsson during their fifty years' association (1840-1890) as the leading factors in the DeLamater Iron Works and in the great advances in naval, merchant-marine, ordnance, and industrial engineering, which marked the career of that institution during the period named. The committee plans to send the portions of material relating to Captain Ericsson to the tercentenary exhibition of the city of Gothenburg in Sweden, to be held there next summer, but the ultimate destination of the whole collection will be the National Museum in Washington. It is hoped that it will later be the nucleus of a great National Engineering Museum recording the accomplishments of the engineering profession in the upbuilding of the nation. The chairman of the committee is Mr. H. F. J. Porter, 29 West 39th Street, New York City.

American and English friends of the late George Louis Beer are joining in preparation of a volume commemorative of his work for history, for the promoting of better Anglo-American relations, for the Peace Conference at Versailles, and for other public ends. Among the

contributors are Professors James T. Shotwell, Charles M. Andrews, and Alfred E. Zimmern, and Mr. David Hunter Miller. The volume will have an introduction by Colonel House, and will commemorate a career and character of great distinction.

By the will of the late Miss Sara Norton, daughter of Professor Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard University, \$5000 is bequeathed to the University of Oxford, and a like sum to Cambridge, as a foundation for prizes to be awarded for essays or studies in the political history of the United States. Lord Bryce's will bequeathed to the University of Oxford £5000 for the encouragement of historical study and research.

In the S. P. C. K. series of *Helps for Students of History* the latest issues, nos. 47-49, are a *Student's Guide to the Manuscripts relating to English History in the Seventeenth Century in the Bodleian Library*, by G. Davies; *History and Ethnology*, by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers; and *Some Aspects of Boundary Settlement at the Peace Conference*, by Alan G. Ogilvie. A publication of similar intention, though larger (pp. 96), is *The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans*, by the Rev. Claude Jenkins, librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth.

In *History* for July we note an address on History and Philosophy by Dr. Ernest Barker, principal of King's College, London, one on the Monastery School of Jarrow, by Dr. R. B. Hepple, and an argument on the Origins of the Punic Wars, by M. Cary.

Students of modern history will be glad to know of the foundation of a new American quarterly review entitled *Foreign Affairs*, of which the first number appeared on September 15. The journal, as its name indicates, will deal with the international aspects of America's political, economic, and official problems. Professor Archibald Cary Coolidge of Harvard University will be the editor, with an editorial advisory board, acting under the auspices of the Council on Foreign Relations, an incorporated body of which Mr. Elihu Root is the honorary chairman, and Mr. John W. Davis president. The announcements afford every promise of high quality and most useful service.

The *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, which came to a pause after the publication of the first part of volume XXIII. in August, 1914, has resumed publication with the issue of the second part of that volume, dated 1920.

The *Revue des Questions Historiques*, publication of which was suspended during the war, resumed publication in July, under the editorial care of MM. Jean Guirand and Roger Lambelin.

In the *Catholic Historical Review* for July we find a survey of the Recent Activities of Catholic Historians, by Professor Patrick J. Healy of the Catholic University of America, reprinted from the *Papers* of the American Society of Church History; one on the Pactum Callixtinum or Concordat of Worms, by Professor Patrick W. Browne of the same

institution; one on the Milan Decree of Constantine and Licinius, A.D. 313, by Rev. Francis Betten, S. J.; one on Lamennais by Rev. Dr. W. P. H. Kitchin of Newfoundland, and one on the American College at Louvain by Rev. J. Van der Heyden of that place.

The July number of the *Journal of Negro History* has papers on the Canadian fugitive slave case of John Anderson, by Fred Landon of Ontario; on the negro Senator Bruce, by G. David Houston; on Lincoln's Emancipation Plan, by Harry S. Blackiston; and on the Journal of Isaaco (pub. 1815), the Mandingo priest who accompanied Mungo Park on his last journey, by Louis N. Feipel. There are also extracts from the Greensborough *Daily Record* of 1911, setting forth reminiscences of a participant in Reconstruction troubles in North Carolina, especially the murder of Stephens, and South Carolina materials of 1874-1876 from the scrap-book of William A. Hayne of Charleston.

A series of volumes entitled *Chapters in the History of Science* has been planned under the general editorship of Dr. Charles Singer of Oxford, for publication by the Oxford University Press. The first volume, which is nearly ready, is devoted to *Greek Biology and Greek Medicine*, and is by Dr. Singer himself.

Miss Ellen L. Osgood bases her excellent text-book, *A History of Industry* (Ginn, pp. vii, 430), on the scheme of study she has been using in the Julia Richman High School in New York. The treatment begins with the dawn of history and concludes with five valuable chapters on the economic development of the United States.

Volume XCVIII. of the Columbia University *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law* includes *Origins of Modern German Colonialism, 1871-1885* (no. 1), by Mary E. Townsend, and *Japan's Financial Relations with the United States* (no. 2), by Gyoju Odate. Volume CI. includes *State Taxation of Personal Incomes* (no. 1), by Alzada Comstock, and *The Whig Party in Pennsylvania* (no. 2), by Henry R. Mueller.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Hugo Preller, *Rationalismus und Historismus: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aufklärung und der Gegenwart* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXVI. 2); Ernst Troeltsch, *Eine Angelsächsische Ansicht der Weltgeschichte* [Wells] (*ibid.*); E. Vermeil, *Un Prophète du Déclin de l'Occident: Oswald Spengler* (*Correspondant*, April 25).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: R. Lantier, *Chronique Ibéro-Romaine, 1919-1921* (*Bulletin Hispanique*, July).

After an interruption since 1914, *Babyloniaca, Études de Philologie Assyro-Babylonienne* has again resumed publication. It remains under the direction of Charles Virolleaud.

A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform and other Epic Fragments in the Pierpont Morgan Library (Yale University Press, pp. 86, pl. 7), edited by Professor Albert T. Clay, presents text and translation of an Akkadian tablet of the twentieth century B. C., containing a deluge story; the editor, from internal evidence and comparison with the deluge stories in the Gilgamesh epic and elsewhere, argues an Amorite or Hebrew origin of the whole legend.

A report of recent excavations in Mesopotamia by the German Oriental Society is embodied in Lidzbarski's *Altaramäische Urkunden aus Assur: Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1921).

The best history of Persian religion which has yet appeared is *La Religione di Zarathustra nella Storia Religiosa dell' Iran* (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1921, pp. xix, 260) by R. Pettazzoni, professor of the history of religions in the University of Bologna. *Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrier* (Jena, Diedrich, 1921, pp. vii, 344), by A. Ungnad, comprises a collection of myths and songs designed to give an introduction to the religious life of the Babylonians and Assyrians.

P. Herfst has made the first approach to the study of *Le Travail de la Femme dans la Grèce Ancienne* (Utrecht, 1922, pp. 122). The volume studies the subject from many angles, including the importance of women's work, the social position of women workers, and the thought of the time on the subject.

Messrs. Putnam's announcements include a volume on *Aspects of Roman Morals in the Time of Tiberius*, by the late T. Spencer Jerome, an American scholar long resident in Capri.

In a small book entitled *The Roman Fate: an Essay in Interpretation* (Cambridge University Press, pp. 80) Professor W. E. Heitland discusses the various factors entering into the decay of the Roman Empire.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Ungnad, *Zur Rekonstruktion der Altbabylonischen Königslisten* (Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, May); A. Poebel, *Ein Neues Fragment der Altbabylonischen Königsliste* (*ibid.*); M. Tierney, *The Origins of Greece: an Epoch in Modern Research* (Studies, June); R. C. Bosanquet, *The Realm of Minos* (Edinburgh Review, July); K. Ziegler, *Solon als Mensch und Dichter* (Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, XLIX. 5); G. Corradi, *L'Asia Minore e le Isole dell' Egeo sotto i Primi Seleucidi*, II. *Antioco II. e le Città Greche dell'Asia* (Rivista di Filologia, January); Matthias Gelzer, *Das Römertum als Kulturmacht* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVI. 2); R. S. Conway, *The Portrait of a Roman Gentleman* [the elder Scipio, in Livy] (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, July); E. G. Sihler, *Disintegration of the Roman Empire and Augustine's City of God*, I, II. (Biblical Review, April, July).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Dr. James Moffatt's Hibbert Lectures of 1921 on the *Approach to the New Testament* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, pp. 240) is a volume of great importance to the historical student, not only because of the subject, but because of its discussions of the aims, methods, and limitations of historical criticism.

The Catholic University of Louvain and the Dominican and Jesuit theological colleges of that city unite in announcing a series of publications, some of them studies, some of them volumes of documents, others manuals of research, in the fields of patristic and medieval ecclesiastical literature, with the general title *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense*—one more of the many signs of what we may call the "will to recuperate" and to advance, on the part of Belgian scholars. The editors will be Canon J. Lebon, professor in the university, Father Raymond Martin, O. P., and Father Joseph de Ghellinck, S. J. In the score or more of issues already announced we note a study of Saint Jerome, in two volumes, by Professor F. Cavallera of Toulouse, two volumes by various hands on the history of the word *sacramentum*, a study of the Gregorian reform by Professor A. Fliche of Montpellier, an edition of the unpublished Latin sermons of Eusebius of Emesa, by Dom A. Wilmart, O. S. B., of Farnborough, an unpublished commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, and the English library catalogues of John Boston of Bury, edited by the Benedictines of Stanbrook.

Much the greater portion (pp. 154) of the *Analecta Bollandiana*, XL. 1-2, consists of a single contribution by that astonishingly fertile scholar, Father Hippolyte Delehaye, the first part of a treatise on the Egyptian martyrs, in which he considers the passages respecting them in early historical and theological writings, the martyrologies and Greek and Coptic *synaxaria*, and the Greek, Latin, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic *passiones*, and the critical problems raised by these various kinds of material.

The Greek patrology of the Berlin Academy excluding writers posterior to the Nicene Council, the resources of a fund established in honor of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff have permitted the issue of a first volume of the *Opera* of Gregory of Nyssa, ed. Werner Jaeger (Berlin, Weidmann, pp. x, 391), containing the text of the books against Eunomius, with the critical notes.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Lynn Thorndike, *Early Christianity and Natural Science* (Biblical Review, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

K. Hampe, in his brief volume *Mittelalterliche Geschichte* (Gotha, Perthes, 1922, pp. vii, 150), undertakes to embody fresh results of investigation as well as to survey the Middle Ages.

Bishop John E. Mercer (formerly of Tasmania) adds to the recent books on the history of science a readable and sympathetic little book on *Alchemy, its Science and Romance* (London, S. P. C. K.).

Mr. Humphrey Milford of London announces two books of much value to the student of medical history, *The Life and Times of Ambroise Paré*, by the American Dr. Francis R. Packard, including a translation of Paré's *Apology*; and *The School of Salernum*, a history by the same author, containing also the text, and a translation, of the *Regimen Sanitatis Salernitanum*, and a note on its origin by Dr. Fielding H. Garrison, of the Surgeon-General's Library in Washington.

G. Schlumberger has published a second volume of *Récits de Byzance et des Croisades* (Paris, Plon, 1922). As in the previous one, which appeared in 1916, the material is picturesque and dramatic.

The Franciscans of the College of San Bonaventura at Quaracchi have illustrated a century of Palestinian history by publishing *Acta S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro Terra Sancta*, part I., 1622-1720 (pp. xxxii, 429), edited by Father Leonardo Lemmens, president of the college.

A valuable addition to the literature on monastic life in the Middle Ages is *Klosterleben im Deutschen Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1921, pp. viii, 258), by J. Bühler.

A collection of documents on the papacy of Celestine V. has been published by Professor F. X. Seppelt of Breslau, *Monumenta Coelestiana; Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstes Coelestin V.* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1921, pp. lxiv, 334). The introduction comprises a careful and scholarly account of the documents.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir Thomas Arnold, *The Decline of the Abbasid Caliphate* (Edinburgh Review, July); Dom Ursmer Berlière, *Écoles Claustrales au Moyen Age* (Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, Académie Royale de Belgique, 1921, 12); J. Mathorez, *Notes sur le Pénétration des Espagnols en France, du XII^e au XVI^e Siècle* (Bulletin Hispanique, January); Horatio Brown, *British Students in Padua* (Quarterly Review, July); Justus Hashagen, *Laieneinfluss auf das Kirchengut vor der Reformation* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVI. 3).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

In the *Bibliothèque* of the French Institute of Florence established by the University of Grenoble appears a solid volume of Florentine documents, 628 in number, 1510-1512, relating to *Le Concile Gallican de Pise-Milan* (Paris, E. Champion, pp. xiii, 732), edited by Professor Augustin Renaudet, of Bordeaux.

E. Raitz von Frentz has written a careful biography of *Der Ehrwürdige Kardinal Robert Bellarmin* (Freiburg, Herder, 1921, pp. xiii, 229). Personal touches make the volume especially interesting.

An impartial and scholarly account of *L'Influence Allemande en France au XVIII^e et au XIX^e Siècle* (Paris, Hachette, 1922, pp. 318) is by L. Reynaud.

The first volume of *Der Politische Katholizismus* (Munich, Drei-Masken-Verlag, 1921, pp. 313) by L. Bergstrasser, well known for his previous study of the Centrum, covers the period between 1815 and 1870. It presents a collection of documents of much interest on the development of Catholic political activity.

In an article entitled "Bismarck's Foreign Policy", by Professor A. Mendelssohn Bartholdy, translated from the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* and published in the *Living Age* of July 22, the reader will find a summary description, by one of the three official editors, of the official compilation of documents of the German Foreign Office, relating to the foreign policies of the German and other European cabinets from 1871 to 1914, *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte), of which the first six volumes have just been published.

Der Deutsch-Englische Gegensatz und sein Einfluss auf die Balkanpolitik Oesterreich-Ungarns (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1922, pp. 105), by A. Hoyos, discusses not only the subject indicated by its title but also other important political questions of the last two decades. The author looks to a closer relationship in the future between England and Germany.

The German book previously mentioned as published by Freiherr von Schoen, ambassador in Paris in 1914, and previously secretary for foreign affairs in Berlin and ambassador at Saint Petersburg, has been translated into English and published by Allen and Unwin as *The Memoirs of an Ambassador*.

A study of the manner in which the papacy has improved its international status since 1914 is published by M. Georges Goyau under the title *Papauté et Chrétienté sous Benoît XV*. (Paris, Perrin, 1922).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Marquis de Forbin, *Les Missions à Rome du Cardinal de Forbin-Janson sous le Pontificat d'Alexandre VIII., 1689-1691*, I. (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, XXXVI. 1); M. de Germiny, *Les Brigandages Maritimes de l'Angleterre au Début de la Révolution* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); G. E. Sherman, *Orders in Council and the Law of the Sea* (*American Journal of International Law*, July); M. Sepet, *La Politique Religieuse de Bonaparte en Italie; Bonaparte et Pie VI.* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); G. Gautherot, *Bourmont à Waterloo* (*ibid.*); A. Hasenclever, *Sinn und Bedeutung der Orientalischen Frage im 19. Jahrhundert* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, CLXXXVII. 2); P. Matter, *Les Voyages de Cavour à Paris* (*Revue de France*, July 1); H. W. C. Davis, *The Conference at Paris* (*Quarterly Review*, July); Gino Speranza, *An Italian Ambassador's Diary of the Peace Conference* [Macchi di Cellere] (*Political*

Science Quarterly, June); R. Recouly, *L'Égypte et les Intérêts Français* (Revue de France, July 1); A. Guignard, *La Paix Française au Soudan* (Revue de Paris, July 15).

THE GREAT WAR

The August, 1921, number of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, issued in May, 1922, is devoted to an "Introduction à l'Histoire de la Guerre Mondiale". The principal articles are: P. Caron, Sur l'Étude de l'Histoire de la Guerre; M. Bloch, Réflexions d'un Historien sur les Fausses Nouvelles de la Guerre; C. Bloch and P. Renouvin, Centres d'Études et de Documentation pour l'Histoire de la Guerre, I. Bibliothèque et Musée Français de la Guerre, II. La Documentation de la Guerre à l'Étranger; P. Renouvin and J. Cain, La Presse et l'Histoire; un Instrument de Travail; le "Bulletin de Presse", I. Les Principaux "Bulletins de Presse" Français et Étrangers, II. Le Bureau Français d'Étude de Presse Étrangère et ses Publications; and R. Viallate, Les Documents Cartographiques sur la Guerre.

The Houghton Mifflin Company are preparing to issue, in a revised edition consisting of four volumes, the remarkable *History of the Great War* prepared by John Buchan, who had during the war, as director of the Intelligence Office, an official position giving him many advantages besides those springing from his literary skill.

Professor Shotwell, general editor of the *Economic and Social History of the World War* projected by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has in hand the manuscripts of volumes on the bibliography of the French aspects of the war, by Dr. Camille Bloch; on the bibliography of Austro-Hungarian materials, by Professor Othmar Spann; on British archives in war and peace, by Dr. Hubert Hall; on the Italian war archives, by Commendatore Casanova; on the British coal industry, food production, and the labor unions during the war, by Sir Richard Redmayne, Sir Thomas Middleton, and Mr. G. D. H. Cole, respectively; on the food supply of Belgium during the German occupation, by M. Albert Henri; on the deportation of Belgian workmen, and forced labor, by M. Fernand Passelecq; and on war government in Austria-Hungary, by Professor Joseph Redlich.

A book certain to attract widespread notice is F. von Bernhardt's *Deutschlands Heldenkampf, 1914-1918* (Munich, Lehmann, 1922, pp. 544). It is a compact history, well supplied with maps. A strong personal note permeates the work. H. Stegemann has published the fourth volume of his useful *Geschichte des Krieges* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1921, pp. xi, 708). M. Schwarte's ten-volume account of *Der Grosse Krieg* (Berlin, Barth, 1921, pp. xii, 517) has reached the eighth volume. He has written with clarity and painstaking.

Major-Gen. Ernst von Wrisberg, during the war a high official of the Prussian Ministry of War, has published two volumes of *Erinner-*

ungen an die Kriegsjahre im Königlich-Preussischen Kriegsministerium (Leipzig, Koehler), which add much to knowledge of the conduct of the war. The first volume, *Der Weg zur Revolution*, is compiled from the records of that section of the Ministry of War which watched political affairs at home; the second deals with mobilization, supply of reinforcements, and other business of the ministry.

An entertaining account of the experiences of a field officer in the Tyrol is Major Tanner's *Bergfahrten in Ladinien (Südtirol), 1915-1916* (Innsbruck, Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia, 1921, pp. 128).

Several noteworthy memoirs and studies of the war by Italian military men have recently appeared. First place goes to General L. Cadorna's *Memorie di Guerra* (Milan, Treves, 1921, 2 vols.), already mentioned in these pages. Others are G. Caprini, *Sommario Storico della Guerra Universale* (Florence, Barbera, 1921); L. Marazzi, *Luci ed Ombre della Nostra Guerra* (Milan, Casa ed. Risorgimento, 1921); Colonel R. Corselli, *La Battaglia del Piave, Studio Storico-Militare* (Palermo, Garibaldi, 1921). The most important book, apart from the memoirs and apologetics of military men, is A. Valori's *La Guerra Italo-Austriaca* (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1921). It gives an account of the Italian phase of the war from a critical and historical standpoint. The author is a journalist of good training.

The Macedonian Campaign: a History of the Salonica Expedition, 1915-1918 (London, Fisher Unwin), by Luigi Villari, son of the late historian Senator Pasquale Villari, has importance from the fact that the author was Italian liaison officer with the various allied armies.

Colonel H. Baginski of the Polish general staff has written a very careful and serviceable account of *L'Armée Polonaise en Orient, 1914-1920* (Warsaw, 1921, pp. 173). A. Gorski deals with a larger topic in *La Pologne et la Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1922, pp. 301).

The activities of the German war cruisers under von Spee are set forth by A. Raeder in the first volume of *Der Kreuzerkrieg in den Ausländischen Gewässern* (Berlin, Mittler, 1922, pp. 456), which bears the title *Das Kreuzergeschwader*. S. Toeche-Mittler has published the last volume of a series of four under the title *Halbstocks die Flagge* (Berlin, Mittler, 1922, pp. 80). It deals with the achievements of the German fleet to the beginning of 1918 and touches upon the work of the fleets of Austria-Hungary and Turkey. A. Gayer continues his account of *Die Deutschen U-Boote* (Berlin, Mittler, 1921, pp. 68) with the third volume of his series covering the period from October, 1915, to April, 1916. A French account of the most striking German personality in the naval warfare is G. Raphael's *Tirpitz* (Paris, Payot, 1922, pp. 198), a critical review of Tirpitz's memoirs.

The director of the German air service, von Hoepfner, has written *Deutschlands Krieg in der Luft* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1921, pp. viii, 184),

which records the organization and work of that branch of the military forces.

The story of the work of the American Red Cross in and for Belgium is recounted in a full and very interesting manner by Dr. John Van Schaick, jr., in a small book entitled *The Little Corner Never Conquered* (Macmillan, pp. 282).

An account of the French counter-offensive against German propaganda is given by Hansi and Tonnelet, *À travers les Lignes Ennemies* (Paris, Payot, 1922, pp. 192). It furnishes a fascinating and dramatic story. Another book which deals with a similar topic is G. Demartial's *La Guerre de 1914: Comment on Mobilisa les Consciences* (Paris, Rieder, 1922, pp. 328). A French account of the way in which Germany was prepared for war with France is *Les Semeurs de Haine: leur Oeuvre en Allemagne avant et depuis la Guerre* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1922, pp. 468) by A. Fribourg. It must be used with care.

G. von Gleich, who served with the Turkish army during the war and who was in a position to acquire a thorough knowledge of the fighting on the eastern front, has written *Von Balkan nach Bagdad: Militärisch-Politische Erinnerungen an den Orient* (Berlin, Scherl, 1921, pp. 185).

A careful and useful account of the diplomatic battle which followed the Armistice is Mermeix's *Le Combat des Trois* (Paris, Ollendorff). It pictures the result as an Anglo-Saxon triumph. A series of lectures on *Les Conséquences de la Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. 198) by A. Liesse, General Malleterre, A. Tardieu, and G. Teissier, deals with military, economic, and financial questions.

Two recent studies on phases of the Versailles Treaty are *Les Confins Franco-Suisses et le Traité de Versailles* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1922, pp. xiv, 125), and *Le Principe des Nationalités et son Application dans les Traités de Paix de Versailles et de Saint-Germain* (Paris, *La Vie Universitaire*, 1922, pp. 458) by V. Blagoyévitch.

GREAT BRITAIN

General review: C. Bémont, *Histoire de Grande Bretagne*, I. (Revue Historique, July).

As a *Festgabe* in honor of the seventieth birthday of Dr. Felix Liebermann, to whose labors the earliest portions of English history are so much indebted, there has been put forth a volume of *Texte und Forschungen zur Englischen Kulturgeschichte* (Halle, Niemeyer), by eleven German scholars, among whose contributions we especially note a study of the development of the law as to accessories and accomplices in Anglo-Saxon times, by Clemens Freiherr von Schwerin, an elaborate treatise on "Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen", by Dr. Max Förster, and an especially valuable study of the ownership of churches in England, by Dr. H. Boehmer.

The *Collected Historical Works of Sir Francis Palgrave* are now completed by the publication of volume VIII., embracing the *Merchant and the Friar*, and an unpublished and unfinished story entitled *Three Generations of an Imaginary Norfolk Family*, and of volumes IX. and X., containing reviews, essays, and other minor writings.

In 1912 the Glasgow Archaeological Society resolved to continue the study of the Antonine Wall by excavating the site of the Roman fort, which formed a part of it, at Balmuirdy, some two miles outside the municipal boundaries of Glasgow. When the war broke out, in 1914, the work of excavation had been completed, but the results have but just been published, in a handsome volume, well illustrated, prepared by S. N. Miller, lecturer in Roman history and antiquities in the University of Glasgow, *The Roman Fort at Balmuirdy* (Glasgow, MacLehose, 1922, pp. xix, 120, pl. 58). The volume describes, with scholarly care, the structural remains, inscribed and sculptured stones, coins, pottery, and miscellaneous small objects found, and concludes that the fort, built about A.D. 142, was occupied by a cohort for almost forty years.

Sir D'Arcy Power makes a valuable contribution to the knowledge of medieval English surgery by translating from the manuscript in Stockholm and editing with learning and skill the *De Arte Phisicali et de Cirurgia* of Master John Arderne (b. 1307,) surgeon to Henry Plantagenet, duke of Lancaster (London, Bale, Sons, and Danielsson).

For its tenth volume the British Society of Franciscan Studies publishes a second volume of *Collectanea Franciscana* (Manchester, University Press, pp. 166), containing contributions by various hands. The longest is a body of additional materials for the history of the Grey Friars in London, derived by Mr. C. L. Kingsford chiefly from wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Mr. Charles Cotton contributes notes on documents in the cathedral library of Canterbury relating to the Grey Friars; Miss Margaret Deanesly gives an account of the Harmony of the Gospels attributed to St. Bonaventura (or to John de Caulibus of San Gemignano); Mr. J. P. Gilson of the British Museum, of an historical interpretation of the Apocalypse by one Friar Alexander; Dr. M. R. James, of the list of libraries (a list of Franciscan origin) prefixed to the Benedictine John Boston's "union catalogue", of which, as is mentioned on another page, the Benedictine nuns of Stanbrook are preparing an edition; and Mr. A. G. Little, of Friar Henry Wodstone and the expulsion of the Jews in Edward I.'s time.

In the series of *Cambridge Studies in English Legal History*, edited by Professor Harold D. Hazeltine, the second volume will be one on *Statutes and their Interpretation in the Fourteenth Century*, by T. F. T. Plucknett.

The Royal Historical Society has inaugurated a publication of diplomatic instructions of the period from 1689 to 1789 by publishing the first

volume (1689-1727) of a series of the instructions given to British ministers to Sweden, edited by Mr. James F. Chance.

A second edition of volume IV. of *A History of England and the British Empire*, by Arthur D. Innes, has recently been published by Messrs. Rivington (London). The four volumes were originally brought out in 1913-1915 (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIX. 859, XXI. 587). In the new edition volume IV. covers the period from 1802 to 1922, the text having been brought up to date by the addition of an appendix containing a chronological record of the course of the Great War and a brief summary of events from January, 1919, to the acceptance of the Irish Treaty on January 7, 1922.

A Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen, in two volumes, by Lady Frances Balfour, is announced for autumn publication by Hodder and Stoughton.

Some Political Ideas and Persons, by John C. Bailey, is concerned with English political life from Queen Victoria to the present time (New York, Dutton).

Old Diplomacy and New: from Salisbury to Lloyd George, 1876-1922 (Murray), by A. L. Kennedy, is a study of the part which Great Britain has played in the world through the medium of her Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs and her diplomatic corps, written by one whose father and grandfather were members of the diplomatic service, and who himself has observed foreign affairs as a member of the foreign department of the *London Times*.

Messrs. Constable will soon publish *The Life of Sir William Harcourt*, in two volumes, by A. G. Gardiner, and *Sir Douglas Haig's Command, Dec., 1915- Nov., 1918*, by George A. B. Dewar, assisted by Lieut.-Col. J. H. Boraston.

British government publications: *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III.*, 1247-1251; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign*, 1585-1586, ed. S. C. Lomas; *Report on the Palk Manuscripts* [Sir Robert Palk, governor of Madras 1763-1767], ed. Col. H. D. Love (Historical Manuscripts Commission).

Other documentary publications: *Transcripts of Charters relating to Gilbertine Houses*, ed. Professor F. M. Stenton (Lincolnshire Record Society); *Final Concords of the County of Lincoln*, vol. II., ed. Canon Charles W. Foster (*id.*); *Chapters of the Augustinian Canons*, ed. H. E. Salter (Canterbury and York Society); *Flint Pleas*, 1233-1285, ed. J. G. Edwards (Flintshire Historical Society); *Diocesis Wyntoniensis, Registrum Johannis de Pontissara*, IX. (Canterbury and York Society); *Year Books of Edward II.*, XVI. 1, 1312-1313, ed. Sir Paul Vinogradoff and Dr. L. Ehrlich (Selden Society); *Calendars of Administrations*, 1540-1659, ed. Canon C. W. Foster (Lincolnshire Record Society).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir J. H. Ramsay, *Roman Advance in Britain and the City of Perth* (Scottish Historical Review, July); Helena M. Chew, *Scutage under Edward I.* (English Historical Review, July); A. F. Pollard, *Council, Star Chamber, and Privy Council under the Tudors*, I. *The Council* (*ibid.*); George Unwin, *The Transition to the Factory System*, II. (*ibid.*); Sir Sidney Lee, *Edward VII. and the Entente* (Living Age, July 22); A. R. G. M'Millan, *The Scottish Admiralty Court* (Juridical Review, March); *Relation of the Manner of Judicatories of Scotland* [A. D. 1605 ca.] (Scottish Historical Review, July).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see page 211.)

The recent civil warfare in Dublin caused the destruction of the Public Record Office of Ireland, an excellent building, specially constructed for the purpose in 1868. It is not thought that the destruction of the archives of the kingdom has been complete, but at the present time we are unable to say how much has been preserved or is capable of reparation. A small inventory of the moderate amount of materials for American history contained in them was prepared in the summer of 1921 for the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, by Professor Herbert C. Bell, but it is not now likely to be published. The collection as a whole was of priceless value, as may be seen from Mr. Wood's *Guide* published in 1920.

Among the autumn announcements of the firm of Fisher Unwin is noted a volume on *Scandinavian Relations with Ireland during the Viking Period*, by Miss A. Walsh.

The *Life* of Dr. Leander S. Jameson, celebrated for the Jameson Raid and as prime minister of the Cape Colony, written by Ian Colvin, is about to be published in London by Messrs. Arnold.

The Macmillan Company has lately published *The Discovery of Australia*, by G. Arnold Wood, professor of history in the University of Sydney (pp. xvi, 541, and 68 maps and illustrations).

A new series (ser. IV.) of the *Historical Records of Australia* (Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament) is opened by the publication of a thick volume of *Legal Papers* (pp. xlv, 1027), running from 1786 to 1827, and chiefly bearing on constitutional law and history.

The *Life and Letters of Archpriest John Joseph Therry*, by Rev. Eris M. O'Brien (Sydney, Angus and Robertson, pp. 389), is the biography of a vigorous and original character, who played a great part in the early and rough days of Australia and in the development of Catholic religion there.

The late William Irvine, of the Indian civil service, had planned a history of the Mughal empire from the death of Aurangzib in 1707 to

Lake's capture of Delhi in 1803; he lived to carry down to 1738 a narrative of high scholarly quality, but not to publish it. Under the competent editorial care of Mr. Jadunath Sarkar the first volume, 1707-1720, has now appeared (London, Luzac), under the title *The Later Mughals*, I.

In the series of source-books for the history of British India, edited by Messrs. G. Anderson and M. Subedar, the second is *The Development of an Indian Policy* (London, Bell), and covers the period from 1818 to 1858.

FRANCE

General reviews: R. Reuss, *Histoire de la Révolution* (Revue Historique, May); E. Driault, *Napoléon au Centenaire de sa Mort, 1921: Étude Bibliographique*, I., II. (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, January, March).

An important announcement comes from the house of Édouard Champion of Paris, namely, of the issue of a series embracing the leading original narratives of French medieval history, texts and translations into French, edited, without undue elaboration of method, by many of the best French scholars. The series will be entitled *Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age*, and will be under the general editorship of Professor Louis Halphen of Bordeaux. The pamphlet announcement, which can be obtained from the publisher, lists already some fifty volumes, including Gregory of Tours, Fredegar, Eginhard, Flodoard, Richer, Dudo of St. Quentin, Ordericus, Guibert de Nogent, Villehardouin, Froissart, Jouvenel des Ursins, Monstrelet, Commynes, and many writers less known, with some volumes of documents—capitularies, treaties, pamphlets of the Hundred Years' War, etc. The first volume will be issued early in 1923; publication will continue at the rate of several volumes a year.

A well-selected variety of documents illustrative of French economic history has been compiled by J. Haymen under the title *Mémoires et Documents pour servir à l'Histoire du Commerce et de l'Industrie en France* (Paris, Hachette, 1921, pp. xxvii, 278).

The author of the remarkable *Histoire de la Gaule*, M. Camille Julian, has published *De la Gaule à la France, nos Origines Historiques* (Paris, Hachette, 1922, pp. 256), putting in briefer and more popular form the results of some of his studies.

Messrs. Heinemann announce a new volume in the *National History of France*, being a translation of M. Franz Funck-Brentano's volume in that series, *The Middle Ages*.

A noteworthy piece of work on the sixteenth century is L. Romier's *Le Royaume de Catherine de Médicis: la France à la Veille des Guerres de Religion* (Paris, Perrin, 1922, 2 vols.). It is not based primarily

upon narratives but rather upon new research in the records of official acts, diplomatic correspondence, and private letters.

The energy, tenacity, and clear political insight of an unpopular historical character are portrayed by L. Mouton in *Un Demi-Roi: le Duc d'Épernon* (Paris, Perrin).

The vice-rector of the Institut Catholique de Paris, L. Prunel, has written an essay on the great movement of reconstruction in the French church which took place after the troubles of the Renaissance, under the title *La Renaissance Catholique en France au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, Desclée, 1921, pp. viii, 317).

The first of three volumes on *Paris sous Louis XIV.* has been published by P. de Crousaz-Crétet under the title *La Vie Privée et la Vie Professionnelle* (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. 319). It is a careful and scholarly piece of work. An admirable biography of one of the corps of capable diplomats who served Louis XIV. is A. F. Aude's *Vie Publique et Privée d'André de Béthoulat, Comte de La Vauguyon, Ambassadeur de France, 1630-1693* (Paris, Champion, 1921, 2 vols., pp. 356, 105).

An historical study of degenerative evolution, and of the way in which political policies were affected by it, is furnished by Dr. A. Donnadieu's *L'Hérédité dans la Maison Ducale de Lorraine-Vaudémont* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1922, pp. xxvi, 334).

Le Roi Stanislaus Grand-Père, 1725-1766 (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1922, pp. 158), by P. Boyé, combines a scholarly account of Stanislaus with a carefully edited collection of his letters to Louis XV.

L'Absolutisme en Bourgogne; l'Intendant Boucher et son Action Financière (Paris, Picard, pp. 192), by C. Arbassier, is not only a fine study of financial history but also of the manner in which the intendants of the old régime were the active builders of royal power.

A. Mathiez has begun the publication of a history of the French Revolution. The first volume is entitled *La Chute de la Royauté* (Paris, Colin, 1922, pp. 210). The same author is bringing out a new edition of J. Jaurès's *Histoire Socialiste de la Révolution Française* (Paris, Librairie de L'Humanité, 1922, pp. 432). L. Madelin has published a series of lectures on *La France du Directoire* (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. xvi, 284) in book form. A phase of the economic history of the French Revolution is dealt with by A. Defresne and F. Évrard and published by the Ministry of Public Instruction under the title *Les Subsistances dans le District de Versailles de 1788 à l'An V* (Rennes, Oberthur, 1922, pp. 584).

A mass of material painstakingly gathered is to be found in C. Richard's *Le Comité de Salut Public et les Fabrications de Guerre sous la Terreur* (Paris, Rieder, 1922, pp. xxiv, 835).

Souvenirs, 1840-1919 (Paris, Drivond, 1922, pp. v, 256) by Comte de Franqueville have been published. They are based on a diary faith-

fully kept for many years. The portions dealing with Morny, Prince Napoleon, and the princes of Orleans are particularly valuable.

Rev. F. A. Simpson of Trinity College, Cambridge, who published in 1909 a study of *The Rise of Louis Napoleon*, has in press an additional volume on *Louis Napoleon and the Re-establishment of the French Empire, 1848-1856* (Longmans).

A very brief but satisfactory *Histoire du Parti Socialiste en France* (Paris, Librairie de *L'Humanité*, 1922, pp. 72) is by P. Louis.

The important factors incident to the renewal of diplomatic relations between France and the Vatican are reviewed by J. Delahaye in *La Reprise des Relations Diplomatiques avec le Vatican* (Paris, Plon, 1921, pp. 322). Georges Goyau deals with the revived Catholic movement in *L'Effort Catholique dans la France d'Aujourd'hui* (Paris, *Revue des Jeunes*, 1922, pp. 160).

A study of French policy during the Balkan crisis of 1912 is embodied in J. Romieu's *Livre Noir et Livre Jaune* (Paris, Costes, 1922, pp. 80). He holds French policy to have been eminently pacific.

An account of the economic organization of France during the war is furnished by A. Delemer in *Le Bilan de l'Étatisme* (Paris, Payot, 1922, pp. 288).

P. Gachon, in his *Histoire de Languedoc* (Paris, Boivin, 1921, pp. vii, 288), essays the difficult task of writing the history of a region which has had neither geographical nor political unity. It is an unusually successful volume, the portion on the medieval period being especially good.

The valuable *Statistisches Jahrbuch für Elsass-Lothringen* appeared for the last time in 1913. The French government is preparing to replace it. Meanwhile, H. Bunle's *L'Alsace et la Lorraine Économiques* (Strasbourg, Imprimerie Strasbourgeoise, 1921, pp. 119) surveys the situation, makes available statistics on population, agriculture, and industry, and furnishes comparisons between 1870 and 1914. It fills a gap for which there is nothing else equally satisfactory. E. Chantriot has written *Une Occupation Militaire d'après-Guerre: la Lorraine sous l'Occupation Allemande, Mars 1871-Septembre 1873* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1922, pp. 670).

The *Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, X. 2, contains a chapter by M. Émile Lauvrière on Acadia under Poutrincourt, Latour, and Alexander, printed in advance from a forthcoming work by him, in two volumes, entitled *La Tragédie d'un Peuple: Histoire du Peuple Acadien de ses Origines à nos Jours*; also a continuation of M. F. P. Renaut's studies on the Family Compact and French colonial policy, the present installment relating to Turks Island, the Manila ransom, and the insurrection of 1768 in Louisiana.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Dermenghem, *Un Ministre de François I^{er}: la Grandeur et la Disgrâce de l'Amiral Claude d'Annebault* (Revue du Seizième Siècle, IX. 1); Lieut.-Col. Drake, *French Secret Service under Louis XV.* (Army Quarterly, July); G. Fagniez, *La Politique de Vergennes et la Diplomatie de Breteuil, 1774-1787*, I., II. (Revue Historique, May, July); C. J. Gignoux, *L'Abbé Galiani et la Querelle des Grains au XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, X. 1); Otto Brandt, *Untersuchungen zu Sieyès* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVI. 3); G. Michon, *La Justice Militaire sous la Révolution*, III. *Le Directoire* (Annales Révolutionnaires, May); F. Masson, *Les Complots Jacobins au Lendemain de Brumaire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, January); H. Buffenoir, *Napoléon et Jean Jacques Rousseau* (*ibid.*, March); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Les Origines de l'Expédition d'Égypte* (Revue de Paris, July 15); G. Caudrillier, *La Découverte du Complot de l'An XII.* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, May); Maurice Levailant, *Chateaubriand et son Ministre des Finances*, I.-IV. (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 1-August 1); A. Cuvillier, *Les Doctrines Économiques et Sociales en 1840, d'après un Journal d'Ouvriers* (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, X. 1); P. Deschanel, *La Politique Extérieure de la France* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15); P. Rain, *L'Histoire de France au Lendemain de la Guerre* (Revue des Études Historiques, April).

ITALY AND SPAIN

Under the charge of a national commission, of which Professor P. S. Leicht, of Bologna, is secretary, Italy is to be provided with a long series of volumes of records of her assemblies, *Atti delle Assemblée Costituzionali Italiane dal Medio Evo al 1831* (Bologna, Zanichelli), embracing assemblies or parliaments of kingdoms and other independent states, and councils of the chief communes. Two volumes have already been published, *Parlamento Friulano*, vol. I., 1228-1420, ed. P. S. Leicht, and *Consigli della Repubblica Fiorentina*, vol. I., 1301-1307, ed. B. Barbadoro.

A much needed and authoritative work upon Angevin law in South Italy has been prepared by R. Trifone under the title *La Legislazione Angioina* (Naples, Lubrano, 1921, pp. cclxxii, 419).

An important addition to the study of Mediterranean and papal politics in the early fourteenth century is E. Haberkern's *Der Kampf um Sizilien in den Jahren 1302 bis 1337* (Berlin, Rotschild, 1922, pp. xiv, 214). It continues a work begun by H. E. Rohde, who lost his life in the war.

An important, thorough, and in many ways original study of Machiavelli is Signor Giuseppe Toffanin's *Machiavelli e il "Tacitismo": la "Politica Storica" al Tempo della Controriforma* (Padua, Angelo Draghi).

Another volume of the Italian section of the great Jesuit history has appeared, vol. II. of Father Pietro Tacchi Venturi's *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* (Rome, *Civiltà Cattolica*, pp. lx, 421).

On March 10, the anniversary of the death of Giuseppe Mazzini, the municipality of Rome published a pamphlet, *Mazzini a Roma*, which contains many of the speeches and letters written by Mazzini during the months of 1849 when he was triumvir of the Roman Republic. The greater number of the letters are here published for the first time, several of them addressed to his mother. The pamphlet includes a group of letters written by Scipione Pistrucci during this same period, also addressed to Mazzini's mother.

The events since the armistice are reviewed in E. Lemonon's *L'Italie d'après-Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1922, pp. 259).

A first-rate study of the decline of the Spanish royal house and its nadir under Henry IV. of Castile is J. Lucas-Dubreton's *L'Espagne au Quinzième Siècle: le Roi Sauvage*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Recouly, *Les Heures Tragiques d'avant Guerre*, IX. *A Rome* (*Revue de France*, August 1; trans. in *Living Age*, September 16).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

A volume which will be valuable for those who have occasion to use the German archives is *Das Deutsche Archivwesen, seine Geschichte und Organisation* (Breslau, Priestbasch, 1921, pp. v, 131) by V. Loewe. It was largely prepared before the war.

An important series of volumes intended to supply documents for the whole course of modern German political history is inaugurated by the Drei-Masken-Verlag of Munich by the publication of the following books: *Der Deutsche Staatsgedanke von seinen Anfängen bis auf Leibniz und Friedrich den Grossen*, ed. Paul Joachimsen; *Justus Moser, Gesellschaft und Staat*, ed. K. Brandl; *Freiherr von Stein, Staatsschriften*, ed. Hans Thimme; *Josef Görres, Rheinische Mercur*, ed. Arno Duch; 1848, *Die Erste Deutsche Nationalversammlung*, ed. Paul Wentzcke; and *Grossdeutsch-Kleindeutsch*, ed. Adolf Rapp.

There is much that is significant in the volume of studies put forth in commemoration of the sixtieth birthday of Professor Erich Marcks, *Vom Staatlichen Werden und Wesen* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1921, pp. 233), including papers by A. O. Meyer on Kant's Ethics and the Prussian State, by O. Westphal on the development of *Staatslehre* in Germany, by M. Laubert on Prussian Posen and the Prussian Constitution, 1815-1818, by V. Valentin on Prussia and Baden in 1849, and by K. Wild on the history of the "friendly relations" between Great Britain and Turkey.

Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. I., by Professor Karl Holl of the University of Berlin (Tübingen, J. C. Mohr, 1922,

pp. 458), contains eight lectures and essays on various matters relating to Luther, of much importance to students of historical as well as of systematic theology. The seventh, on the Cultural Significance of the Reformation, and the eighth, on Luther's Significance for the Progress of the Art of Biblical Interpretation, may be especially mentioned.

Dr. Hartmann Grisar has set down his matured opinion on one of the great moments of Luther's life in the first volume of his *Luther zu Worms und die Jüngsten Drei Jahrhundertfeste der Reformation* (Freiburg, Herder, 1921, pp. vii, 89).

The rise of Prussia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is briefly reviewed in G. Küntzel's *Die Drei Grossen Hohenzollern und der Aufstieg Preussens im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, pp. 169).

A good portrayal of an interesting character is to be found in Wilhelm von Bippen's *Johann Schmidt, ein Hanseatischer Staatsmann* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1921, pp. v, 331). The book emphasizes that portion of Schmidt's career which centres about the Congress of Vienna.

A study of one of the leading figures in the history of German liberalism is *Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann's Politische Entwicklung bis 1848* (Leipzig, Haessel, 1921, pp. 248) by H. Christern. It is satisfactorily done.

The defeat of Germany has revived interest in the empire's most successful statesman. Among recent books dealing with Bismarck are A. von Scholtz's *Erlebnisse und Gespräche mit Bismarck* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1922, pp. 150); Maria Fehling's *Bismarcks Geschichtskennntnis* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1922, pp. 126) and O. Baumgarten's *Bismarcks Religion* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1922, pp. 153).

K. Obser has edited and published *Jugenderinnerungen Grossherzog Friedrichs I. von Baden, 1826-1847* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1921, pp. xvi, 124). These memoirs were dictated while the author was recovering from a severe illness and suffer both from the fact that they do not cover his most active years and because they were done from memory, which was often inaccurate. The position and action of a much lesser prince, and the constitutional and political relation of a very small state to the empire, are illustrated by Dr. Friedrich Schneider's *Aus den Tagen Heinrichs XXII., Souveränen Fürsten Reuss ü. L., 1867-1902* (Greiz, 1921, pp. xvi, 114), comprising memoirs of two ministers and letters of the prince.

The background of the war is the main theme of W. Spickernagel's *Fürst Bülow* (Hamburg, Alster-Verlag, 1921, pp. 264). So also V. Valentin, in *Deutschlands Aussenpolitik, von Bismarck's Abgang zum*

Ende des Weltkrieges (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1921, pp. xv, 418), pays most attention to the diplomatic background of the war. He defends Bethmann-Hollweg vigorously. F. Immanuel in *Fünfzig Jahre Deutscher Geschichte* (Berlin, Verlag Veteranendank) also makes the background of the war the chief item of interest.

To the *Cambridge Historical Series* edited by the late Sir George Prothero, the Cambridge University Press has added a *History of Switzerland, 1499-1914* (pp. xiv, 480), translated from the German of the late Professor Wilhelm Oechsli of Zurich.

M. Paul E. Martin, sub-archivist of the canton of Fribourg, has published *Études Critiques sur la Suisse à l'Époque Mérovingienne, 534-715* (Geneva, A. Jullien, pp. xxxii, 469), in which he presents the history of Switzerland from the Frankish conquest to the death of Pepin II., and discusses the condition of the population and the characteristics of the Frankish administration.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Schneider, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft in Deutschland* (Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, XLIX. 3); Max Lehmann, *Zur Geschichte der Preussischen Heeresreform von 1808* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVI. 3); W. Platzhoff, *Die Anfänge des Dreikaiserbündnisses, 1867-1871* [using archival materials withheld from Sybel] (Preussische Jahrbücher, June); Lieut.-Col. De Thomasson, *Le Règne de l'Aristocratie Allemande de la Chute de Bismarck à nos Jours* (Revue Universelle, July 1); A. Rivaud, *La Propagande Allemande* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, April); A. W. G. Randall, *The Origins and Influences of Spenglerism* (Contemporary Review, July); K. Müller, *Calvin und die "Libertiner"* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XL.).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

A full account of Dutch historical writings throughout the years 1913-1919, prepared by Professor H. Brugmans of Amsterdam, is to be found in pp. 135-150, 311-331, of the current volume (CXXVI.) of the *Historische Zeitschrift*.

Volume XIX. of the *Werken* of the Linschoten Vereeniging is a translation into Dutch, well edited by Mr. S. P. L'Honoré Naber, of Robert Juet's journal of Henry Hudson's voyage of 1609 to Nova Zembla and America. Appendixes of documents relating to the voyage are added.

La Haye d'autrefois et pendant la Guerre (Paris, Chiberre, 1922, pp. 308), by E. Melvill de Carnbee, contains much information on the history of the Hague. In particular it relates little known facts about the international situation at the Hague during the war. It deals also with the internment of the German emperor and the crown prince.

C. de Lannoy's *L'Alimentation de la Belgique par le Comité National, Novembre 1914 à Novembre 1918* (Brussels, 1922, pp. xii, 422) is of especial value inasmuch as part of the records of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium, on which it is based, have been destroyed.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Moullé, *Les Corporations Drapières de la Flandre au Moyen Age* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Swedish Historical Academy's *Handlingar*, XXXIV. 1-2, is entirely devoted to a memoir of the great archaeologist Oscar Montelius, by Bernhard Salin, and a bibliography of his writings, 408 in number.

J. Meisl has begun a *Geschichte der Juden in Polen und Russland* (Berlin, Schwetschke, 1921, pp. xii, 342), of which the first volume has appeared. The book is serviceable rather than brilliant.

Professor K. Stählin of the University of Berlin has given a vivid picture of a famous personality in *Der Briefwechsel Iwans des Schrecklichen mit dem Fürsten Kurbskij, 1564-1579* (Leipzig, Schröpler, 1921, pp. 175).

A volume long suppressed by the Russian censor is A. N. Radishchev's *Reise von Petersburg nach Moskau, 1790* (Leipzig, Schröpler, 1921, pp. 189), which has been translated into German by A. Luther.

A. Boudon has studied in detail *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie: leurs Relations Diplomatiques au XIX^e Siècle* (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. xlvii, 580), with admiration for the policy of the Vatican.

L. von Schlözer has edited and published K. von Schlözer's *Petersburger Briefe, 1857-1862* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1921, pp. xv, 303). These letters of a German diplomat are written in clear and humorous style. They are especially good in the analysis of character.

An attempt to analyze the causes of the breakdown of the Russian government, in so far as they lay in the industrial situation, is made by S. Köhler in *Die Russische Industriearbeitschaft von 1905-1917* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1921, pp. viii, 107).

The *Memoirs of an Ambassador*, of which the first volume is to be published this autumn by Messrs. Hutchinson of London, and the second volume later, is a translation into English of the *La Russie des Tsars pendant la Grande Guerre* of M. Maurice Paléologue, the last French ambassador to the Russian imperial court, a book which we have already mentioned, and of which the second volume, June 3, 1915-August 18, 1916, has appeared in Paris (Plon).

Gabriel Hanotaux has published *Histoire des Soviets* (Paris, Makowsky), the first part of which gives an objective presentation of the

facts arranged in chronological order. The succeeding portions consist of a series of studies by competent writers. Freiherr von Freytag-Loringhoven has made use of material not previously available in *Die Entwicklung des Bolschewismus* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1921, pp. iii, 110). He has written other volumes upon revolutionary Russia.

An account of the dramatic events which ushered in the war after the war in Poland, written by the commander of the defensive forces, C. Maczewski, is *Les Luites de Léopol* (Warsaw, 1921, 2 vols.). The same subject has been studied by Dr. J. Bogonowski under the title *La Lutte pour Léopol* (Danzig, 1921). Another phase of the war between 1918 and 1921, *La Lutte pour la Silésie* (Warsaw, 1921), is discussed by the commander of the Polish forces, J. Pryzinski.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Paléologue, *Les Énigmes de l'Empereur Alexandre I^{er}* (Revue Universelle, August 1); Graf M. Montgelas, *Der 30 Juli 1914 in Petersburg* (Deutsche Rundschau, July); M. Paléologue, *La Russie des Tsars pendant la Grande Guerre*, VII.-XI. (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1-August 1); *The Communist Experiment in Russia* (Round Table, June); Jerome Davis, *A Sociological Interpretation of the Russian Revolution* (Political Science Quarterly, June); B. Nikitine, *L'Émigration Russe* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, April); S. Zagorsky, *La Famine Russe et ses Causes* (Revue d'Économie Politique, March); J. Kessel, *Le Procès des Socialistes Révolutionnaires Russes* (Revue de France, July 15).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

The fifth volume of Mr. André Veress's *Fontes Rerum Transylvanicarum* (Veszprém, 1921, pp. xvi, 316) contains the *Annuae Litterae* of the Jesuits in Transylvania from their arrival to the end of the Báthory period, 1579-1613, with many additional documents and extracts for ecclesiastical history, from archives in Rome, Vienna, and Spain.

The work of the Germans in one of the sensitive points of Europe is recounted by P. Traeger in *Die Deutschen in der Dobrudscha, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Deutschen Wanderungen in Ost-europa* (Stuttgart, *Ausland und Heimat*, pp. 222).

An authoritative account of the war from the Turkish point of view is given in the *Memoirs of Djemal Pasha* (London, Hutchinson), whose narrative begins with the Young Turk *coup d'état* of January 23, 1913.

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

R. Grousset has published a three-volume *Histoire de l'Asie*: I., *L'Ancien Orient Hellénistique, l'Islam, l'Orient Latin et les Croisades*; II., *L'Inde Ancienne, la Chine Ancienne et Médiévale, les Civilisations de l'Indo-Chine*; III., *Les Empires Mongols, la Perse, l'Inde et la*

Chine Modernes, Histoire du Japon (Paris, Crès, 1922, pp. 308, 400, 488). It is a well-written account showing a remarkable grasp of the history of the Continent.

A hostile account of *L'Aventure Kémaliste* (Paris, L'Édition Universelle, 1921, pp. 104) is by O. Kiazim. It denies the Kemalist movement a national character. Lieut.-Col. B. M. Abadie has described a phase of the war in Asia Minor under the title *Opérations au Levant: les Quatre Sièges d'Aïntab* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1922, pp. 151).

A brief but unusually satisfactory manual on a topic for which only larger works have hitherto been available is *L'Art Bouddhique* (Paris, Laurens, 1921, pp. xvi, 164), by H. Focillion.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has published *War and Armament Loans of Japan* (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. xv, 221), by Ushisaburo Kobayashi, D.C.L., in which the whole subject, from the Meiji Restoration in 1867 to the present time, is treated in its historical, economic, and statistical aspects.

Japan's Pacific Policy, especially in relation to China, the Far East, and the Washington Conference, by Kiyoshi Karl Kawakami, is in particular an analysis of Japan's part in the Washington Conference (New York, Dutton).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. K. Sarkar, *Les États Républicains (Ganas) dans l'Inde Ancienne* (Revue Historique, May); Auriant, *Une Occupation Égyptienne de Smyrne, Février-Mars 1833* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVI. 1).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Library of Congress has recently acquired, for the Division of Manuscripts, the mimeograph copies of reports of general and group meetings of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, bound in seven volumes; papers and files of the office of the Attorney General of the United States, 1789-1870; from the Department of State, the volumes of transcripts from the archives of Great Britain, France, and Spain deposited there by the late Henry Adams; letters and papers of Gen. Robert Anderson, especially those relating to the defense and evacuation of Fort Sumter; reports in General Grant's handwriting of his Vicksburg campaign, and of the operations of the armies subsequently commanded by him, up to June, 1865; photostat copies of all Lincoln papers in the collection of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, and of the Confederate papers in the collection of Mr. W. K. Bixby; and the letters and papers of Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama, 1877-1907.

The American Book Company has brought out a volume by Professor Evarts B. Greene entitled *Foundations of American Nationality*, which,

combined with Professor Fish's *Development of American Nationality*, published in 1913, constitutes a history of the United States for colleges and for the general reader.

The inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on June first by Dr. Samuel E. Morison, the new Harmsworth professor of American history, a neat survey of American history and of the reasons why young Englishmen should be interested in it, has been published by the Clarendon Press as a pamphlet, *A Prologue to American History*.

American Democracy, by Willis M. West, is an account of the social, political, and industrial development of America in terms of democracy (Boston, Small, Maynard, and Company). *The United States: its History, Government, and Institutions*, by Daniel Howard and Samuel J. Brown, is published by the firm of Appleton. The Macmillan Company has brought out an *Industrial History of the United States*, by Louis R. Wells. *The Makers of America*, by Professors James A. Woodburn and Thomas F. Moran, of Indiana, is from the press of Longmans.

Doubleday, Page, and Company have announced for autumn publication several autobiographical works of interest: *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, in two volumes; *All in a Life-Time*, by Henry Morgenthau; *My Life and Work*, by Henry Ford in collaboration with Samuel Crowther; and *The Story of a Varied Life*, by Rev. Dr. W. S. Rainsford.

The Myth of American Isolation: Our Policy of International Co-operation (World Peace Foundation), by Professor Pitman B. Potter of the University of Wisconsin, is written "to show that the American nation has from the very beginning led the way in the movement for international co-operation, and that the legend of national isolation as a description of American policy is sheer myth".

Annie E. S. Beard is the author of a volume entitled *Our Foreign-Born Citizens: What they have done for America*, being life-stories of famous citizens of foreign birth (New York, Crowell).

The Russians and Ruthenians in America by Jerome Davis, *The Poles in America* by Paul Fox, *The Italians in America* by Philip M. Rose, and *The Greeks in America* by J. P. Xenides, are volumes in the series of *Racial Studies* published by the firm of Doran.

The March number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* includes a biographical account, by Jane Campbell, of Mrs. Caroline E. White, Reformer, and a continuation of Elizabeth S. Kite's papers on Gérard, the French minister. The June number contains a paper on Bishop Camillus P. Maes of Covington, by Dr. J. Bittremieux and J. Van der Heyden; and one by Sister Mary Eulalia Herron upon the Work of the Sisters of Mercy in the United States: Hartford, 1851-1872—Providence Diocese, 1872-1921.

In the June number of the *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* appears the second part of the paper by S. Gordon Smyth on the Pioneer Presbyterians of New Providence, Virginia.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Macmillan Company has brought out *Our Old World Background*, by Charles A. Beard and William C. Bagley.

Cherokee and Earlier Remains on Upper Tennessee River, by Mark R. Harrington, is among the *Indian Notes and Monographs* of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.

The first of six volumes of the *Works of Samuel de Champlain*, edited by Dr. Henry P. Biggar, which the Champlain Society of Toronto is to publish, has now been issued to members, presenting the early writings to 1608, with a portfolio of plates and maps.

Woman's Life in Colonial Days, by Carl Holliday, is brought out in Boston by the Cornhill Publishing Company.

The July *Bulletin* of the Boston Public Library contains in facsimile a journal kept by an unknown writer who in 1746 accompanied Governor Clinton of New York on a journey from Boston to Albany to hold a conference with the Six Nations.

Alexander Henry's Travels and Adventures in the Years 1760-1776, edited, with an historical introduction and notes, by Dr. Milo M. Quaife, is from the press of Donnelley.

The Old South Association of Boston has printed, as no. 222 of the *Old South Leaflets*, Paul Revere's own accounts of his midnight ride, namely, his deposition of about 1775, and his letter of 1798 to Jeremy Belknap; they are accompanied by an account of Revere's life by Professor S. E. Morison.

Little, Brown, and Company have brought out *The Constitution of the United States: its Source and its Application*, by Thomas J. Norton.

The Navy Department has issued the second of the three volumes of series 2 of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion* (pp. 864), and, as one of the publications of the Historical Section, an account of *United States Naval Railway Batteries in France* (pp. v, 97, pl. 22) compiled by Lieut.-Comm. Edward Breck.

Judge Walter Clark is the author of two papers, *North Carolina at Gettysburg and Pickett's Charge a Misnomer*, and *Sixty Years afterwards and the Rear Guard of the Confederacy*, which he has issued in one pamphlet (Raleigh, the author).

Dr. William Dudley Foulke's *A Hoosier Autobiography* (Oxford University Press, 1922, pp. 252) is a pleasant narrative, which, besides

entertainment, gives useful insight into the history of many causes for which the author has fought, besides the main endeavor narrated in his *Fighting the Spoilsmen*. There is also some good matter concerning Roosevelt. It is interesting to learn that the valuable library of Icelandic literature collected by Dr. Foulke's brother-in-law, that excellent scholar the late Arthur Middleton Reeves, for his *Finding of Wineland the Good*, has been presented by Dr. Foulke's daughter to the University of Louvain.

The Century Company has brought out in its *New World* series *The Building of an Army: a Detailed Account of Legislation, Administration, and Opinion in the United States, 1915-1920*, by John Dickinson.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The anonymous book *L'Évolution de la Race Française en Amérique: Vermont, New-Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island*, tome I. (Montreal, Beauchemin, 1921, pp. x, 277), is formed by the republication of a series of newspaper articles dealing with French-Canadian emigration to the United States.

The Maine Historical Society, by the efforts of its treasurer, has now been freed of all the debt incurred by the erecting of its building in Portland. The Maine Genealogical Society has been merged in the Historical Society, and its books added to the library of the former, which now has been reopened. President K. C. M. Sill, of Bowdoin College, has been made president in the place of Dr. Henry S. Burrage.

Annals of Brattleboro, 1681-1895, in two volumes, edited by Mary R. Cabot, is published in Brattleborough by E. L. Hildreth and Company.

The state of Massachusetts has issued volume XXI. (pp. 1012) of the *Acts and Resolves of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, embracing the resolves, orders, votes, etc., of the sessions of 1779 and 1780, when Revolutionary government under the province charter came to an end. To these have been added the town charters and analogous documents of 1692-1714, which in their chronological place in volumes VII.-IX. were given only by title. The texts and indexes have the elaborate character usual in this great series.

Brockton and its Centennial: Chief Events as Town and City, 1821-1921, edited by Warren P. Landers, is issued by the city.

The second volume of the *Rhode Island Court Records*, covering the period 1662-1670, has been printed and placed on sale by the Rhode Island Historical Society.

An index of all the Rhode Island items which appeared in Boston newspapers before 1750 has been made by Mr. George F. Dow, and

purchased by Col. George L. Shepley of Providence, and can be consulted at the Shepley Library.

The Connecticut Historical Society has just secured, from private possession, the complete original rolls of the Connecticut militia while in service during the War of 1812. The existence of these rolls had not been previously known. The collection consists of about 500 muster, pay, and receipt rolls, copies of a number of rolls, numerous official letters, and orders for sundry supplies for the troops; also a volume containing an indexed copy of all of the rolls.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

In the January number of the *Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* appears a paper, read by Mr. Peter Nelson at the Lake George meeting of the association in October, 1921, on the Battle of Diamond Island, a little known event in the Burgoyne campaign. The paper is accompanied by a map of the Lake George region. In its April number the *Journal* contains an address on the history of forest conservation in that state, by C. R. Pettis; a history of the Pulteney Purchase (Robert Morris's portion of the Phelps and Gorham Purchase, acquired by Sir William Pulteney and English associates), by Paul D. Evans; and an account of surrogates' courts and records, in colony and state, by R. W. Vosburgh.

The July number of the *New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin* contains a paper, by Reginald P. Bolton, on the Home of Mistress Ann Hutchinson at Pelham, 1642-1643, and the second installment of the list of American Revolutionary Diaries, compiled by Dr. William M. Thomas.

Ossian Lang is the author of a *History of Freemasonry in the State of New York* (New York, the Grand Lodge).

The contents of the July number of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* include: the Board of Proprietors of East Jersey, by David McGregor; Professor Benedict Jaeger, Early Entomologist of New Jersey, by Harry B. Weiss; New Jersey over a Century ago, as seen by a Frenchman (Théophile Cazenove); the Number of Soldiers in the Revolution, by Cornelius C. Vermeule; and a Young Man's Journal, 1800-1813 (cont.).

Professor R. W. Kelsey has prepared a *General Index to the Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia*, vols. I. to X., 1906-1921 (Haverford College).

The January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains a biographical sketch of Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821), by Thomas Willing Balch; a first installment of the record of a Journey to Bethlehem in 1802, by Joshua Gilpin (father

of Henry D. Gilpin); and a reminiscence, principally of the battle of Brandywine, dated in 1840 and signed by Elizabeth W. Smith (granddaughter of Lieut.-Col. Persifor Frazer of that action). In the April number are found a paper entitled the Real Thomas Paine, Patriot and Publicist: a Philosopher Misunderstood, by Henry Leffman; the Philadelphia Method of Selecting and Drawing Jurors, by T. Elliott Patterson; and the concluding installment of the Journey to Bethlehem.

Among the articles in the July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: Early Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Allegheny County, by Hon. A. B. Reid; Careers of the Croghans, by Stephen Quinon; Washington's Western Journeys and their Relation to Pittsburgh, by Robert M. Ewing; and the Critical Period in Pennsylvania History, by John P. Penny.

The principal of the *Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society September 2, 1921, was part II. of the Autobiography of William Michael, being an account of his experiences in the expedition to suppress the Whiskey Rebellion. The issue for November 4 contains an account, by William F. Worner, of the early history of the Strasburg Scientific Society; that for December 2 contains the concluding part of the Historical Notes from the Records of Augusta County, Virginia, by Charles E. Kemper. The number for January, 1922, continues from 1776 through 1781 the series of Lancaster County items printed in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* of that period. That for February continues from 1813 through 1827 C. H. Martin's account of the revenues derived by the federal government from that rich county.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains an article, by William Woodward, on the Thoroughbred Horse and Maryland; one by Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat on Governor Lionel Copley; continuations of the biographies of James A. Pearce and Thomas Johnson, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner and Mr. Edward S. Delaplaine, respectively; and some hitherto unpublished provincial records of the early eighteenth century.

In volume 24 of the *Records* of the Columbia Historical Society the chief pieces are: a paper on Executives and Voters of Georgetown, by William Tindall; one on James H. Blake, third mayor of Washington, 1813-1817, by Allen C. Clark; a summary of notable suits in early courts of the District of Columbia, by Dr. F. Regis Noel; and an entertaining paper on Art Life in Washington, by Miss Leila Mechlin, of the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

Mr. Fairfax Harrison contributes to the July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* a paper entitled When the Convicts Came, relating to the importation of convicts into Virginia in

pursuance of the act of Parliament of 1718. Mr. Harrison also contributes to the department of Notes and Queries two letters of James Patton, written from Augusta County in 1742, and two from Gov. William Gooch, written in 1743 and 1745. The third installment of Letters from William and Mary College is of the period 1795-1799. They are all addressed to David Watson and are from the collection of Mr. Thomas S. Watson.

Hampden Sidney College has brought out *College of Hampden Sidney Dictionary of Biography, 1776-1825* (pp. 322), by A. J. Morrison. The *Dictionary* is prepared in two parts, one for the eighteenth century and one for the nineteenth, each with its separate index. Among the 800-odd names included are not a few men of distinction, among them William Henry Harrison, of whom it is recorded that he "had the misfortune to be chosen President of the United States". Unfortunately, of many men, even of the later period, but meagre and indefinite records have been obtained. There are several portraits in the volume.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* for July contains, aside from genealogical matter, some notes on patents for inventions by Virginians, 1805-1824, by A. J. Morrison; several letters from the manuscripts of the Royal Society of London, written from Virginia in 1665 by Rev. Alexander Moray; several letters of John Preston, 1793-1813, and one on the battle of Williamsburg, May, 1862, by Col. D. K. McRae of North Carolina.

The July number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains an address on the Relations between the British Dominion of Virginia and the Dominion of Canada, delivered at Annapolis, Nova Scotia, in August, 1921, by Dr. J. Murray Clark of Toronto.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has recently received more than ten thousand additional documents from the legislative and executive departments of the state. Most of them were salvaged from basements and attics of old buildings once used by the state, but they are in good condition. They fill out the collections to such an extent that the Commission's series of governors' papers and legislative papers are now practically unbroken from 1776 to the present. The Hall of History has received the Joseph Hyde Pratt World War Collection of relics, several hundred in number. Mr. R. D. W. Connor has just completed a survey of the British Public Record Office for North Carolina material not included in the *Colonial Records*. Arrangements will be made to secure transcripts at once of numerous documents he has found.

In the *South Carolina Historical Magazine* for January, just received, Miss Webber continues notices of marriages and deaths from the (Charleston) *City Gazette* of 1795, and proceedings of 1765 in the court of ordinary.

In the June number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* Dr. Roland M. Harper presents a second paper on the Development of Agriculture in Georgia from 1850 to 1880, the present study being concerned with the section of the state below the falls line, as the former was with that above. There is a sketch of Judge Beverly D. Evans (1865-1922), by Orville A. Park. The Howell Cobb Papers, edited by Dr. R. P. Brooks, cover in this number the period 1854-1856.

Volume IV. of the *Publications* of the Mississippi Historical Society contains a paper on the Mississippi Territory in the War of 1812, by Mrs. Dunbar Rowland, a series of rolls of Mississippi commands in that war, papers on Gov. Daniel Holmes and on the Closing Days of the War of Secession by D. H. Conrad and W. A. Love, respectively, and a discussion of a portion of De Soto's route by the latter writer.

WESTERN STATES

The June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains an interesting address by Professor Frank H. Hodder of Kansas on "Propaganda as a Source of American History"; a useful paper on the Political Significance of the Pension Question, 1885-1897, by Mr. Donald L. McMurry of Iowa; and an account of the Federal Indian Policy in California, 1846-1860, by Mr. William H. Ellison, of the Oregon Agricultural College. In the section of documents Dr. T. C. Blegen prints a typical Norwegian "America letter" of 1835.

Ground has been broken for an additional wing to the Museum and Library Building of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society at Columbus. Dr. Edwin E. Sparks delivered the chief address at the annual meeting on September 9.

The January-June issue (double number) of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* contains the Memoirs of Benjamin Van Cleve (1773-1821), a pioneer of Ohio. Besides an account of the journey westward and descriptions of pioneer life, the writer records his military experiences in 1792-1794, which included a journey from Fort Washington to Philadelphia and return in 1792 as military courier.

Ginn and Company have brought out a volume on the *History and Geography of Ohio*, by William M. Gregory and William B. Gitteau.

Volume VII., no. 7, of the Indiana Historical Society *Publications* is *Fort Wayne in 1790: Journal of Henry Hay*, edited by Dr. M. M. Quaife. No. 8 is *One Hundred Years in Public Health in Indiana*, by William F. King.

The June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains a history of Crawford County, by H. H. Pleasant; Pioneer Stories of the Calumet, by J. W. Lester; and a continuation of Carl F. Brand's History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana.

The principal articles in the January, 1921, number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* are: Dr. David Nelson and his Times (1793-1844), by W. A. Richardson, jr.; a letter from Senator James R. Doolittle to Robert T. Lincoln, June 3, 1884, together with some correspondence relating thereto between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Duane Mowry, who contributes the letter; the Indian Wars of 1876, from letters of Thaddeus H. Capron, by Cynthia J. Capron; and an historical sketch of the Congregational Church of Toulon, Illinois, 1846-1921, by Clare McKenzie.

The *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* for April has papers on Catholic Education in Illinois, by Mrs. Charles L. Larkin; on the Early Days of St. Joseph's College at Bardstown, Kentucky, by Rev. W. J. Howlett, and some notes on the Illinois Part of the Diocese of Vincennes, by Joseph J. Thompson.

The latest publication of the Filson Club, no. 32, is *The Filson Club and its Activities, 1884-1922* (Louisville, pp. 64), by its secretary, Otto A. Rothert, embracing the history of the club, lists of its publications and of papers on Kentucky history prepared for the club, and lists of members.

Edwin P. Morrow, Kentuckian, a Contemporaneous Biographical Sketch, by Willard R. Jillson, is from the press of C. T. Dearing, Louisville (privately printed).

In the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* for April, 1921 (issued in June, 1922), appear an account by Dr. George F. Mellen, of the McClung Collection (see next item); an article on the Natchez Trace, by Dr. R. S. Cotterill; one on the Boyhood of President Polk, by Hon. A. V. Goodpasture; and a contemporary account of the battle of King's Mountain, by Alexander Chesney, a captain in Ferguson's command. The latter document is edited, with an introduction and notes, by Dean Samuel C. Williams of Emory University, who discovered the manuscript in the British Museum.

The Library Trustees of the city of Knoxville, Tennessee, have published in a pamphlet (pp. 49) the *Proceedings* at the presentation to the Lawson McGhee Library of the important collection made by the late Calvin M. McClung, a collection of several thousand volumes, rich in material for the history of Tennessee, and of several neighboring states. The contents are to a large extent itemized in the pamphlet, but the library has issued a printed catalogue which, though not elaborate in form, goes far toward constituting a check-list of Tennessee history.

The Michigan Historical Commission has brought out *Michigan Bibliography*, in two volumes (pp. 753, 466), prepared by Floyd B. Streeter. The work is described on the title-page as "a partial catalogue of books, maps, manuscripts, and miscellaneous materials relating to the resources, development, and history of Michigan from the earliest times to July

1, 1917; together with citation of libraries in which the materials may be consulted, and a complete analytic index by subject and author". The present work is limited to the titles of all printed materials, maps, and atlases relating directly to Michigan included in the principal libraries of Michigan and the Library of Congress, the maps in the Port Huron Public Library and the library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the manuscript materials in the Burton Historical Collection. The entries number somewhat more than 8,600, including about 1,000 maps and atlases and 2,000 volumes of manuscript. It is planned to bring out in the future volumes covering materials in other libraries and other classes of materials not included in this bibliography.

The principal articles in the June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* are: Marshall Mason Strong, Racine Pioneer, by Eugene W. Leach; the First Traders in Wisconsin, by Louise P. Kellogg; and Memories of a Busy Life, by General Charles King. In the section of Documents are found a Journal of Charles M. Baker of a journey from Vermont to Wisconsin in 1838, and some letters of George B. Smith, written from Chicago in 1843, on his way to Wisconsin.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has recently received a collection of manuscripts, scrap-books, and souvenirs relating to the Civil War from Henry C. Parkhurst, a member of the Sixteenth Iowa Infantry during the war and later a newspaper correspondent. The society has in press a volume by Jacob Van der Zee on *The British in Iowa*, a volume by Howard H. Preston on *The History of Banking in Iowa*, and two volumes by Earl S. Fullbrook on *The Red Cross in Iowa*.

Articles in the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are: Sioux City and the Black Hills Gold Rush, 1874-1877, by Erik M. Eriksson; a Typical Iowa Pioneer Community, by George F. Parker; and three narratives concerning Iowa Troops in the Sully Campaigns (on the northwest border during the Civil War).

The June number of the *Palimpsest* contains an account, by Clint Parkhurst, of the Attack on Corinth; the July number the story, by Ruth A. Gallaher, of the Handcart Expeditions, a migration of Mormons in 1856; and that for August a sketch, by J. C. Parish, of Robert Lucas, the first governor of Iowa.

The principal contents of the April number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are continued papers: the Followers of Duden, by William G. Bek; Pioneer Life in Southwest Missouri, by Wiley Britton; and Shelby's Expedition to Mexico, by John N. Edwards.

In the July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* are found a paper by R. C. Crane on Some Aspects of the History of West and Northwest Texas since 1845; one by Adele B. Looscan on the Life and Service of John Birdsall, attorney general of the Republic of Texas; the second paper on the Indian Policy of the Republic of Texas, by

Anna Muckleroy; and a continuation of the Bryan-Hayes Correspondence, edited by E. W. Winkler.

Official Explorations for Pacific Railroads, 1853-1855 (University of California *Publications in History*, vol. XI., pp. 187), by George L. Albright, gives a systematic history of four principal explorations, made at the middle of the nineteenth century: the northern, between the 47th and 49th parallels of latitude, conducted by Governor Stevens of Washington Territory; the central, between the 38th and 39th parallels, conducted by Captain Gunnison and Lieutenant Beckwith; that along the 35th parallel made by Lieutenant Whipple; and the extreme southern, essentially along the line of the 32d parallel, made by Lieutenant Parke and Captain Pope. In addition Mr. Albright gives some account of the surveys made from the Pacific side, in California and Oregon, by Williamson, Abbott, and Parke. The study also includes an examination of earlier plans for a Pacific railroad.

The July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* includes an account, by Mr. Clarence B. Bagley, of the journey of a company, of which he was a member, across the plains to Oregon in the early fifties; an article on the Newspapers of Washington Territory, by Professor Edmond S. Meany; and one by J. A. Meyers on Finan McDonald, Explorer, Fur Trader, and Legislator.

The June *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society has a paper by George W. Wright on the Origins of the Prehistoric Mounds in Oregon; a continuation of that of Howard M. Ballou on the History of the Oregon Mission Press; a body of documents on ex-slaves in Oregon, contributed by Fred Lockley; a group of transcripts of mining laws of Jackson County, edited by Verne Blue; and a further installment of the letters of Rev. William M. Roberts, third superintendent of the Oregon Mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Story of Sitka, the Historic Outpost of the Northwest Coast, the Chief Factory of the Russian-American Company, by C. L. Andrews, has been brought out in Seattle by the author.

CANADA

We note with great pleasure the formation on May 18 last, of the Canadian Historical Association. This society, intended to perform for Canada services similar to those performed in the United States by the American Historical Association—to advance the interests alike of Canadian history and of history in Canada—was formed by a reorganization of the Historic Landmarks Association of Canada, instituted in 1907, those having the project in charge availing themselves of the sixteenth annual meeting of that body, held in Ottawa on the date named. The officers chosen for the year 1922-1923 were the following: president, Mr. Lawrence J. Burpee of Ottawa; vice-president, Mr. W. D.

Lighthall of Montreal; secretary-treasurer, Mr. C. M. Barbeau of Ottawa; and editor of publications, Dr. James F. Kenney, of the Public Archives of Canada. The council consists, in addition to these officers, of the following members: Dr. Arthur G. Doughty, Mr. Pierre G. Roy, Professors George M. Wrong, Chester Martin, and Archibald MacMechan, and Judge F. W. Howay.

The September number of the *Canadian Historical Review* contains an official account of the formation of the Association just mentioned, by Mr. Kenney; also articles on the Noblesse of Canada, by Capt. Charles E. Lart; on the Mystery of Walker's Ear, 1764, appearing to solve that celebrated mystery, by Professor A. L. Burt of the University of Alberta; and on Wheat and the Trade Cycle in Canada, by Professor Gilbert E. Jackson. The Marquess of Sligo contributes some Notes on the Death of Wolfe.

A summer school of research in Canadian history has been maintained this last summer with great success in the Public Archives of Canada, at Ottawa, by Professor J. L. Morison of Queen's University, and attended by eleven students, ranging in provenance from British Columbia to Nova Scotia. The undertaking will be continued next summer, despite Professor Morison's change of place, elsewhere noted.

The valuable Marfleet Lectures delivered at the University of Toronto by Sir Robert Borden, formerly prime minister of Canada, have been published by the Oxford University Press under the title *Canadian Constitutional Studies* (pp. 163).

Nearly half the pages of the *Papers and Records*, vol. XIX., of the Ontario Historical Society are occupied with a sketch, by Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank, of the Public Life and Services of Robert Nichol (*circa* 1774-1824), a member of the legislative assembly and quartermaster-general of the militia of Upper Canada. Among the other papers in the volume are: the Diary of Benjamin Lundy, written during his journey through Upper Canada, January, 1832, with an introduction and notes by Fred Landon; Deep Waterways Movements, their Origin and Progress in Ontario, by James Mitchell; Some References to Negroes in Upper Canada, by Hon. William R. Riddell; the Rev. Robert Addison and St. Mark's Church, Niagara, by Professor A. H. Young; and a seventh chapter of Asa R. Hill's study of the Historical Position of the Six Nations. The Society's *Annual Report* for 1921 has appeared.

Volume VIII. of the *Transactions* of the Women's Canadian Historical Society contains a paper by Justice Latchford on Philemon Wright and the Settlement of Hull (opposite Ottawa), and a number of contributions toward the history of Bytown, the progenitor of Ottawa. The society's *Annual Report* records, among other accessions, the acquisition of some letters of Lord Strathcona to Col. Robert Brown, the gift of Mrs. Brown.

The *Transactions* of the London and Middlesex Historical Society, part XI., consists of a diary, December, 1832–March, 1833, of Rev. William Proudfoot, early Scottish Presbyterian minister in London.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The May number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* contains articles by Professor William L. Schurz on the Spanish Lake (the Pacific), by Professor J. Fred Rippy on Anglo-American Filibusters and the Gadsden Treaty, and by Osgood Hardy on the *Itata* Incident; also a group of documents from the Archives of the Indies, contributed by Miss Irene A. Wright, and narrating picturesquely, from the Spanish side, the story of Sir Anthony Shirley's raid on Jamaica in 1597. Two-thirds of the August number (pp. 325–483) is occupied with a single monograph, on Anglo-Spanish Relations in America in the years from 1763 to 1774, by Miss Vera L. Brown, of Bryn Mawr College, a monograph very well worth doing and very well done, in which the relations consequent upon the Treaty of Paris, in Honduras, Louisiana, and Florida, and especially the affair of the Falkland Islands, receive for the first time a thorough treatment, well based, intelligent, and interesting. There is also an historical note by Miss Irene A. Wright of Seville on the founding of Havana, a subject which, by the way, the municipality of Havana has sent Señor Nestor Carbonell to the Archives of the Indies to investigate at full length.

The Hispanic Society of America has published an ample volume, by Professor Bernard Moses, formerly of the University of California, on *Spanish Colonial Literature in South America*, with a bibliography; it emphasizes especially the writers of the eighteenth century.

La Fin de l'Empire Espagnol d'Amérique (Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1922, pp. 192), by A. Marius, is a careful study which insists upon the view that the causes of the independence of South America are not to be found in an excess of misery and ignorance resulting from royal despotism.

A contribution of high value to the history of the conquistadores is Mr. R. B. Cunningham Graham's *The Conquest of New Granada, being the Life of Gonzalo Jimenez de Quesada*, whom the author places on a level with Cortés and Pizarro.

A biography of General Urquiza, *Urquiza: El Juicio de la Posteridad*, has been published by the Comisión Nacional de Homenaje al General Urquiza, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of his establishing the unity of the Argentine Republic.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Vignaud, *How America was Really Discovered* (Living Age, July 15); A. J. Morrison, *John G. De Brahm* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); J. Hashagen, *Die Vereinigten*

Staaten und Ostasien vor der Erschließung Japans (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, January); F. B. Simkins, *The Election of 1876 in South Carolina* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); *Letters of a High-Minded Man: Franklin K. Lane*, cont. (World's Work, July–September); B. J. Hendrick, *The United States at War: Walter H. Page*, cont. (*ibid.*); E. G. Calbó, *La Intromisión Norteamericana en Centroamérica* (Cuba Contemporánea, May); E. Roig de Leuchsenring, *La Enmienda Platt: su Interpretación Primitiva y sus Aplicaciones Posteriores* (*ibid.*, July); M. André, *Bolívar et la Démocratie*, VII., VIII. (Revue de l'Amérique Latine, July, August); J. P. Renaut, *Le Brésil et l'Europe: la Reconnaissance de l'Indépendance, 1825–1826* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVI. 1).